

A CATHOLIC STUDIES CHRIST¹

THE loss which Catholic scholarship has endured in the death last year of Père de Grandmaison becomes more apparent every month. Already, in so short a time, at least four volumes have appeared from his pen, some consisting of collected papers which should not be lost, others of papers hitherto unpublished. All of these reveal that peculiar quality of their author which made him so efficient and stimulating a teacher of young men. For this is what essentially he was. He possessed originality in abundance; his essays on Personal Religion alone are sufficient evidence of that. But more conspicuous was his genius for surveying whole fields of thought, for comparing one branch of learning with another, for co-ordinating conclusions, for distinguishing essentials from things less relevant, so preparing the ground that others might be encouraged to pursue their studies further.

Perhaps nowhere has this genius for order been more manifest than in his article on "Jesus Christ" written for the new edition of the "Dictionnaire apologétique de la Foi catholique." When the fasciculus containing that article first appeared, some twenty-five years ago, it was at once recognized as a masterpiece, both of learning and exposition. As the "Dictionnaire" has continued to appear, full as it is of essays of first-rate value, the remark is continually heard that Père de Grandmaison's summary of the present state of learning in regard to Christ our Lord still remains the gem of the series.

It is now, as we have said, some twenty-five years since that article was published. That a scholar of Père de Grandmaison's calibre should pursue his subject further, and keep abreast of the ever-changing if not ever-progressing times, was to be expected; nevertheless we were not prepared for the amazing erudition revealed in this his last work, the fruit of the study of the last quarter of a century. Had the author, during that time, concentrated on this subject alone, the result might have been more intelligible. But we know

¹ *Jesus Christ : Sa Personne, Son Message, Ses Preuves.* Par R. P. Leonce de Grandmaison, S.J. 2 vols. 3rd edit. Paris : Beauchesne. Pp. xxxviii, 412, 694. Price, 100.00 fr.

that he did not. Père de Grandmaison has been conspicuous in many fields. He has been the promoter of a newspaper; he has been the soul of a movement among Catholic authors in Paris; he has produced article after article on current topics, especially on such matters as concerned the Catholic revival in France; at the same time, as the present writer has had reason to experience, in his poor flat in Paris he has been at the service of anyone who might need his help. *Omnia omnibus factus*; the craving to help others, and the turning of his gifts, not so much to acquire learning, as to use them for the benefit of others, is the secret of Père de Grandmaison's fascination. It is the secret, too, of everything we have ever read that bears his name.

It is the secret of the two large volumes that lie before us. Though the student of the essay we have already mentioned may recognize in it the foundation on which the author has built, or rather, let us say the source from which he has started, still he will find it little more. Since it was written, science has moved, and Père de Grandmaison has moved with it. Questions which were then keenly discussed, and are now of no moment, are wholly set aside; other questions which have since arisen take their place. Books of thirty years ago which are now out of date are no longer mentioned; instead, the output of England, France and Germany has been keenly watched, up to the last day in 1926 when the work was finally completed. Indeed, we would consider this thoroughness of observation of contemporary Christ-literature, with his judicious estimate upon it, to be the chief value of Père de Grandmaison's contribution, at all events on its apologetic side.

Before going further, it may be well to make two comments on the general result of reading these volumes. Evidently the author is at pains to approve all learning wherever he is able. He takes all other authors on their face value; he assumes that all are honest men, earnestly seeking for the truth; much as he is at times compelled to disagree with a conclusion or to point out a fallacy, yet nowhere is there found a word of abuse, or a hint that his rival is insincere. Once or twice, it is true, he will suggest that prejudice has blinded clear vision, or that too hasty a desire to draw a conclusion has led to an ignoring of facts; but always this is done with perfect patience, assuming that the

writer whom he ventures to correct seeks, not the success of his own idea, but the simple truth. On the other hand, again and again, he quotes with approval the words of those who are usually considered to have little sympathy with his school. Strauss, Baur, Renan, Reinach, Loisy, all in one place or another receive this treatment at his hands. He seems to say that though they are fundamentally wrong, still, in the field of science, they must be treated as honest men, and therefore, whenever he can agree with them he will. Indeed, some of his footnotes seem to be expressly inserted for this purpose.

The second marked characteristic of these volumes, following on what has just been said, is the number of times Père de Grandmaison is able to quote with approval English non-Catholic authors, in contrast with those of Germany or of France. It is true that, with very few exceptions, he pays little attention to the modernists of to-day; but one feels as one reads, indeed in one place he seems to say it, that this phase is no more than a disease, as was the rationalism of sixty years ago, which is painful while it lasts, but which is too extravagant to leave a permanent impression. Modernistic interpretation and exegesis adds nothing positive to Scripture studies; what it seems to destroy will be seen to grow again. But when he deals with the positive and more serious writers, who do not think they have rediscovered the Scriptures after nineteen hundred years, but who believe that others have known them long ago, his points of contact are many. Above all, he owes much to those patient English scholars whose collection of material had added so much for the evidence of the Gospels in the earliest times.

What we have said leads us, before we go further, to another reflection. It were much to be desired that our English non-Catholic Scripture scholars would make more account of their Catholic fellow-students. There is a prejudice against Catholics among those who do not know them, on the ground that they may not think for themselves; that Holy Church has fixed the lines along which they may go, and that they have no choice but to go along them. Even if, for the sake of argument,—though in fact we would deny the implication—we admit everything that is here said, still we would maintain that non-Catholic students have much to learn from our own. In the first place, and chiefly, they will find among our Catholic writers, especially at the present

moment, our Catholic writers in France, a summary and estimate of conclusions which they practically never find among themselves. To one who has read much of the non-Catholic Scripture exegesis of to-day, nothing is so unsatisfactory as this absence of critical judgment. Theories are aired, discoveries are made, some quite sound, others fantastic, but seldom do we find a due estimate of the one or the other. The consequence is an utter absence of proportion in the acceptance of conclusions. Take, as an example, Hastings' "Dictionary of Christ and His Gospels"; it is a work in many ways quite admirable, but because of all lack of unity its articles are lost in contradictory confusion. Such an effect in the end must be injurious to Scripture study. It runs into assumptions which have only too little foundation; it must endlessly be engaged in correcting itself; it leads the student who comes after to doubt his masters, and ultimately to doubt Scripture itself. And such a result, to speak of nothing else, is avoided by the studies of Catholic scholars. In their researches, they may be confined; for the moment let that pass. But they have at least a standard of judgment. They are able to read the works of other writers without being overwhelmed by a show, or even an excess, of learning. More accurately than others they can weigh an argument, compare one conclusion with another, and will not easily accept as an axiom what, after all, is not more than probable at best. Nowhere more than in the study of Scripture is there need to move slowly, as the constant alterations and retreats of the last hundred years have proved; and by no better means can this waste of labour be avoided than by the study of our Catholic scholars. Whether others accept their conclusions or not, at least they will give them pause, and compel them to find better reason than that which is usually found for the faith that is in them.

In giving an account of the contents of Père de Grand-maison's two volumes, a synopsis of a synopsis is unsatisfactory. Still we can do little more. For the first two books, as the author has divided his work, on the Sources and the Surroundings of the Gospel narrative, obviously there is little which may not be found elsewhere. Fillion in particular, supplementing Edersheim and others, has written more abundantly, and with more research, on the second. We would only remark on the admirable caution, urging too

vehemently neither side of the controversy, with which Père de Grandmaison approaches the question of the priority of Matthew or Mark. His conclusion is negative. One cannot read his analysis of the argument without seeing that, for the present at least, the question is not finally solved; much less can it be accepted, as beyond all further controversy, that the Gospel of Mark, as we now possess it, has preceded the Gospel of Matthew.

Another matter which has grown in importance in late years is the question of the rhythmical style of the Scripture text. To us it seems that this study of rhythm and the drawing of conclusions from it, can be easily overdone. All great style has rhythm, whether among ancient or among modern writers; and the greater the manner of the author, the more his rhythm will appear. Père de Grandmaison, who has evidently given this subject special attention, draws upon the rhythms of savage or half-savage peoples, used by them as aids to memory; but we believe that no less illustrations could be taken from Newman, or Carlyle, or Burke, used by them as aids, not to memory only, but to the vivid impression of their words upon the mind.

But Père de Grandmaison's real interest does not lie here. For the sake of completeness he has had to deal with these preliminaries; when he comes to his central topic, then his soul awakens. Though the footnotes are still abundant, showing that he is fully alive to what others have written on the subject, still he has himself so much to say that he has less room for discussion with others. He begins with the Message of Jesus. After an examination of the significance of John the Baptist, and the way Christ our Lord introduced Himself to the world, he speaks of His method and His preaching in parables. Then he analyses the main points of the message proper. And first is the good news of the Fatherhood of God. He speaks of the attempts of the ancient cults to attain to a knowledge of this Fatherhood; of the far nobler idea of it contained in the Jewish revelation; of the danger of this last, no longer, as of old, lest it should be contaminated by the cults around it, but lest it should harden into mere form, and an exclusion of other men from its possession.

‘Into this hungry world, Jesus came, with an announcement of God the Father that surpassed their highest expectations

and yet at the same time deeply satisfied them all. He detracted not one whit from the dignity, the sanctity, the power of the God of Abraham and Moses; but He emphasized the more His sovereign goodness and beneficence. He was a Father indeed from whom a son might ask and He would give, whom a son must obey yet who in return would receive, not the wages of a slave, but a true son's inheritance. He was a Father who had a care of His own; who would see to it that not a hair of their head should perish unobserved, or that they should be tried beyond what they could endure. He was a Father whose life was eternal, and who had no other wish for His children than that they should share this eternal life with Him, not only hereafter, but also, as far as might be, here also on this earth.

Next he passes on to the second part of the Message, that of the Kingdom of God. With the announcement of it, Jesus began; He died on the Cross proclaimed a King; His last words were a commission to claim for this Kingdom the spaces of earth and heaven. He took men's conceptions as He found them, filled with the notions of a kingdom that was one day to be theirs. He expanded them; He taught them new methods of conquest; the method of preaching the Word, the method, not of revolution, but of the leaven in the meal, of the grain of mustard seed growing to a tree. He described that Kingdom, one in which would be included every type and race of man, one in which not all would be equal, but which would have its sheep and its shepherds. It would have its own New Law, yet within its boundaries would be many mansions, varieties in practice of many kinds; when the consummation came its joys would transcend all that this world could offer, or that man could conceive.

Thirdly was the New Commandment; new in this, that in the mouth and heart of Jesus Christ it took on a new meaning. Carefully He analysed it for those who heard Him; that they should not blame others when they themselves are to blame; that they should give and it will be given unto them; that they should forgive and they in turn will be forgiven. Let their gifts be hidden; let them be measured not by quantity but by the spirit in which they are bestowed, a widow giving her farthing might do more than a rich man emptying his purse. Let them give an example to each other, let them help each other as brethren, let it be a glory rather

to serve a brother than to master him. This is the true justice; the true love of the neighbour; and for those who can receive it, He does not hesitate to carry the doctrine to heroism. To love an enemy and bless him, to give all that another may profit, to lay down life itself that a fellow-man may live, to this does Christ lead us when He says: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as I have loved thee."

Under these three headings, as others have done before him, but with a vividness and clearness of analysis all his own, *Père de Grandmaison* sums up the essentials of the teaching of Jesus Christ. He next comes to His witness of Himself. And first, as is natural, He contrasts that witness with the witness of other teachers. They, one and all, were but men; Jesus Christ from the beginning claimed to be the Lord. He was the Master of the Law; greater than Moses, whose decrees He would change, substituting the New for the Old. He would choose whom He would Himself to follow Him; He would forgive whom He would their sins; He would set Himself up as the ideal to be followed; He would die when and where He chose; He would promise to those who were faithful rewards beyond the power of any man to give. From first to last, with not a doubt or hesitation, Jesus Christ does not contrast Himself with other leaders of religion; He acts as one who is on another plane from them all.

So He reveals Himself in manner; when He speaks of Himself He is even more explicit. His Father has put everything into His hands; let all men come to Him and He will refresh them. He is the one Being whom men need to know; when He is discovered and confessed, to be even the "Son of God," the man who first confesses Him is blessed beyond all others. None the less, at the opposite extreme, while He is the Lord, He is also the Saviour; while He is the Judge, He is also the Redeemer. He is the Founder of all that is new, and the new is sanctioned by the eating, no longer of a Paschal Lamb, but of His own body and blood. Nor is this said only in the presence of His friends. The covenant once established, He proclaims Himself, that same night, when He stands before His enemies on trial for His life. When He hangs upon the Cross next day, this one thing His executioners hurl at Him, that He made Himself the Son of God.

Père de Grandmaison here wisely pauses to remind us that all this and more is to be found in the synoptic Gospels alone. Hence, when we come to John, we are not disconcerted, we are only confirmed in our impression by his more explicit teaching. For John, His Master is "the way, the truth, and the life"; as such, John does but let Him make more clear what the synoptists have already taught. He is the very Bread of life; if any man come to know Him, he will come also to know the Father; if any man keep His word, he shall not see death for ever. Before Abraham was, He is; He and the Father were one; His Father was in Him and He was in the Father; men were right to call Him Master and Lord, for that in truth He was. This was eternal life, that men should know the only true God, and Him whom He had sent, Jesus Christ. Let critics boggle as they may at one text or another; the whole argument is incontestable. Jesus Christ, seen in Matthew, Mark and Luke, as much as in John, claimed to be the Prophet that was to come, claimed to be the Messenger from on high, claimed to be the very Son of God.

Such, without a possibility of doubt, was the claim of Jesus Christ, and through the ages men have been compelled to say whether or not they will accept it. Whatever the vagaries of unbelief, the efforts to escape the dilemma, mankind has invariably come back to the confession of the intrinsic truth and greatness and uniqueness of the Man; it has invariably come back to the choice that must be made. Jesus Christ, the Man of deepest religious life, the Man immaculate, in whom sin was never found, the Man secure and free from every doubt, whether of things of God or of Man; Jesus Christ may not lightly be passed by. Jesus Christ, the meekest of men and yet the most majestic, the most commanding and yet the most obedient; when He makes claim He must at least be allowed to make it from a height towering above that of other men. Nor is it only this; at the opposite extreme He must also be considered. For not only in Himself does He stand apart, but in His love, in His affection for mankind, in all that He has given to man, and done for man, and suffered for man and won for man, in the intimate union with all that is contained in the life of man, He is unique and alone in all the world.

It is not only followers of Christ who have recognized

the problem of Jesus Christ. From the beginning the pagan world saw it; and it answered, first by persecution unto death, then by ridicule and scorn, later by imitation, again by the reasoning of philosophy, explaining Him away, interpreting and confusing His teaching with the teaching of others. And modern paganism does likewise. The Jewish world saw it to its cost. It met the problem mainly by calumny, and since that failed it pronounced on it anathema. Blasphemy followed as a matter of course; bastard, magician, apostate, heathen, immoral hypocrite, these were the titles with which Jesus Christ was honoured by His own people. Later Judaism has looked on and has corrected these early ribaldries. It has recognized what Jesus Christ has done for the world; nevertheless it has pronounced His condemnation just. "Because of thy good works we accuse thee not; but because thou, being only man, dost make thyself the Son of God, . . ." this is the abiding sentence of Judaism from the days of the Temple until now.

Since the time of Jesus Christ there have arisen other movements, outside and inside Christendom, and each in turn has come across this "Child which is set for the fall and resurrection of many." Mohammed knew Him, but chiefly through apocryphal sources. He made much of Him; he made Him a prophet; the Mohammedan of to-day honours His name, but knows nothing more. Within the Christian world, for fifteen centuries, in spite of occasional defections, faith in Jesus Christ was fostered, and in that faith Christendom was kept one. But at length the breach came. The supernatural, along many lines, of humanism, of philosophy, of so-called reason, of art, was interpreted always in terms of the natural; among them all the name of Jesus Christ was smirched, and the problem of His being was evaded. Rationalism did the rest; with such a preparation of the ground, Voltaire could dare to face Jesus with a sneer. Modern philosophy has again endeavoured to correct this baseness. Strauss, Renan, Sabatier, and many more, have honoured the Man. But they honour Him as a philosopher; they will grant Him nothing that He claims.

So, to a great extent, stands the Rationalism of to-day. Renan has given it its formula; almost all that has followed since his time has taken its cue from him. It has added new weapons; the subtle, meticulous analysing power of Loisy, the

experimentalism of men like Meyer and Kirsopp Lake, the personal interpreting of an infinite number of others, each one accepting or rejecting what he will, has involved the problem in a cloud of dust which has made, for them and for their followers, the facing of it, the very understanding of it, well-nigh impossible. Nevertheless, that behind the cloud the problem still remains, these men well know. To evade it is not to solve it; to undermine its evidence is not to disprove its truth; and ever and again, one or another among them will turn aside and acknowledge that with all their science, and analysis, and elimination, and interpretation, they have proved nothing; Jesus Christ still remains to them a mystery (Loofs).

The Catholic Church, or rather let us say the Christian world, is more generous and therefore more daring. It accepts in all its bearings the dogma of the Incarnation, the union of the natures of God and man in one single person, Jesus Christ. It sees in the Gospels, taken only as history, the indubitable proof of that Person, who can only be explained by that double nature, the one, as it were, superimposed upon the other and lifting it out of itself. It hears Him claim that pre-eminence; it knows that He speaks true; however it observes Him, it comes away with the impression that He is one who "is at home in two worlds," as Illingworth has well expressed it. The mystery of Jesus Christ has been solved by Himself, by His words, by His deeds, by His whole existence among men; and we who live in darkness and the shadow of death are not mistaken when we follow Him, "the Way, the Truth, and the Life," rather than the countless will-o'-the-wisps that dance and die away again over the morass of this earth.

Such in brief is the thesis of what is to us by far the most important section of Père de Grandmaison's great book. He has given his reasons for a whole-hearted acceptance of the Gospels; he has drawn out the essence of the teaching which those Gospels contain; he has out-lined the portrait of Him who taught it, and has faced the mystery which that portrait involves. He now turns to ground which has been trod by others many times, the evidence of Jesus Christ in His works. There is little need to follow him here in detail when he discusses miracle in general and its evidential value, or the evidential value of prophecy. These he explains with his

usual acuteness of distinction, stating clearly how far they may be taken as evidence, and how far the Catholic apologist rests his argument upon them. Nor, perhaps, need we follow him closely when he turns to Jesus the Prophet, and the prophecies which He uttered. Men of good will about Him rapidly hailed Him as such: "I perceive Thou art a prophet";—"A great prophet hath risen up among us";—"This is indeed the prophet that was to come into the world." His prophecies concerning Himself were emphatic and explicit, above all, of His passion and death, and resurrection. His prophecies of the Kingdom of God, its nature, and its future, are among the most daring, the most confident, the most assuring in the whole of the Gospel narrative. The prophecies of the consummation, the end of the world and the coming of the new kingdom, Père de Grandmaison discusses more at length; with his usual willingness to face every real difficulty, he pauses here to examine the texts and their meaning. It is a masterpiece of erudition and analysis; we know of no volume in which the eschatological question of Jesus has been more ably discussed.

From the prophecies he turns to an examination of the miracles; and once more he follows familiar paths. With regard to miracles, the first thing is to be convinced of the fact; and this he claims for the miracles of the Gospels. They are of the essence of the books themselves; without them they would not be what they are. The evangelists have written them down in evident conviction, never doubting but that their readers were equally convinced! Modern objections are considered; in the end they reduce themselves to this, that miracles in fact are to be flatly denied and therefore the miracles of Scripture must in some way be explained. That they can be ruthlessly ruled out is no longer possible; they belong as much to the authentic text as any other part of the narrative. With these two preliminaries Père de Grandmaison allows the story of the miracles to speak for itself, content to emphasize their evident truth, and to expose the absurdity of refutations which rest alone on assumption. In all this part no student will say that Père de Grandmaison has not taken full account of the modern theorists, above all that of those who find in miracles the use of hidden forces which time will reveal to all.

The mystery and significance of the resurrection is rightly

treated in a place apart; as Père de Grandmaison says, both for its own sake and because of all that has of late been said concerning it this must be so. He establishes the death; then his first witness for the Resurrection is that of St. Paul. This is examined not only in its statement, but more especially in its bearing on all St. Paul's teaching concerning the Redemption and Atonement: only twenty-five years after the event, he speaks to those who bear witness with him, having seen the risen Lord with their own eyes. Armed with this evidence our author approaches the later narrative of the Gospels. A very careful harmony is given to us, after it the story of the apocryphal Gospel of Peter; the latter, with all its elaborate additions, bears evident traces of the Gospels on which it is founded, thus confirming their authority and acceptance. The quantity of evidence is meagre enough; yet, beyond a doubt, as the Acts repeatedly emphasize, the fact of the Resurrection is to the early Church the beginning and end of all. This need not surprise us; the certainty of the fact in the minds of those who knew it to be true, has overshadowed all other details; beside it, they have become of little moment.

But in the little that we possess there is much that is significant. There has been no attempt on the part of any witness to describe the Resurrection; none has ventured to add a word of his own. All are agreed in emphasizing the fact of the empty tomb; not until all are convinced of this does the Lord show Himself to His apostles. Simple facts are then told, proving the simple truth of a living Man; the fact united to faith in Him is assumed as obvious, needing no further proof or illustration. This is not illusion on the part of those who write; it is not written to deceive; the belief which followed, to which St. Paul could so confidently appeal, is a belief that is founded on certain evidence. The one confirms the other; faith of such a kind could never have been founded on a fable; a fact of such a kind must indeed have been proved beyond a doubt to be the basis of a faith so deep and lasting.

In the light of this exposition, modern objections are carefully and patiently considered. For the most part, they are not objections; they are explanations, hypothetical suggestions of one or another writer to explain phenomena; again we are asked, as before, to raise a cloud between ourselves

and the mystery that we may not be compelled to give a final answer. Père de Grandmaison passes through the cloud, faces the mystery, and asks himself, in conclusion, what bearing it has upon the whole mission of our Lord. It is simply this: If Jesus Christ has really risen, then is He really the Son of God. The event was contained in the prophets; twice in His life, He Himself promised so to fulfil them. The Jews demanded a sign; this was the sign that He would give them, and at His death they confessed that they had understood His words aright. The Resurrection is the crowning act of a life full of wisdom and power; the life, the death, the rising again are in perfect harmony, each completes and confirms the other.

Knowing as we do the author's life interest in the comparative study of religions, we are not surprised to find that he completes his work with a special section on the relation, if any, between the religion founded by Jesus Christ and that of other cults around it in the Roman and Greek world. As a summary of these cults and their working, this section is singularly efficient. Père de Grandmaison shirks no difficulties, here or elsewhere; he goes into the "mysteries" and describes them, carefully distinguishing, however, between what is known fact and what is only learned conjecture. He follows them in their history, their development, their local successes; he finds in them all two common traits, secrecy and individuality. Their votaries were undoubtedly fervent; their devotion turned more and more towards the notion of a saving God, away from the tyrant God of the ancient pagans. Thus far, at least, they prepared the way for Christianity. But there was another side. Their liturgy found in the new-comer a rival, not an ally; their moral standards differed fundamentally from those of the New Law; their secrecy, their exclusiveness, were very different from the reserves demanded by St. Paul.

In contrast with them all is the living spirit marked in the first preachers of the new Gospel. Jesus Christ is the Lord; Jesus Christ has redeemed the world by the shedding of His blood; Jesus Christ is the Mediator, the reconciliation between God and sinful man; Jesus Christ is the reward for which His followers will gladly die; Jesus Christ is the source from which all spiritual gifts and blessings flow on the race of man; the immediate proclamation of the Holy

Name, with all that comes with it, is the first signal fact of the new dispensation. It is no derivation from elsewhere; it is born of no infiltration. The Jew sees it and hates; the pagan world sees it and persecutes; whatever analogies, whatever condescensions may be afterwards noticed or allowed, the faith in Jesus Christ, in all its essentials, of creed and of practice, comes straight from Him, and finds its explanation in Him alone.

Nor have succeeding generations altered it. Père de Grandmaison goes into the question raised of late years, of the distinction between the teaching of St. Paul and that of his Master. He shows with astonishing clearness how it is a distinction of circumstance, never a difference of fact; a distinction made necessary because of those to whom the apostle spoke and with whom he thought, never a tittle being changed in the message. St. Paul knew the needs and aspirations of those who, having lost faith in the old heathenism, sought it again in the new rites growing up around them; he answered their craving, showing them that in Jesus Christ they had satisfaction beyond the power of any other cult or mystery to give. The analysis of St. Paul's Epistles here given, looked at from this angle, is a masterpiece of exegesis.

From the mysteries to the Body mystical. Let us study the first ages of the Church as we will, let us give the Gospels any interpretation, we cannot escape the abiding fact that the earliest ages of the Church looked on Jesus Christ as the true Son of God, risen and alive, abiding with and in its members, "yesterday, to-day, and the same for ever." The Acts of the Apostles describes the flame that rises from the fire of the Evangelists; the Apocalypse of St. John reflects its glow and all-consuming might. For all alike, Jesus Christ is alive, among them in all His glory; Baptism, the Eucharist, Sanctifying grace, Conversion of heart, the Practice of prayer, all have their explanation in this single truth, that He is with them "all days, even to the consummation of the world." They never doubt it; whatever the suffering, the persecution unto death, they look into the future with complacency. Jesus Christ, "having risen, dieth no more," and therefore His Body will live on.

And so the belief has remained through the ages the same, firm and unshaken. From Ignatius of Antioch, through

Irenæus to Augustine, among missionaries far off like St. Patrick, with makers of rules like St. Benedict, the witness is always the same. We come to the new generation, Gregory the Great, Anselm, Ludolph of Saxony, Bernard, Francis, thence to Vincent Ferrer and Francis Xavier; there is not in them all a single deviation from the first ideal. It is expressed in the *Imitation of Christ*, in words that would have gladdened the hearts of Stephen, and Paul, and Barnabas; in the *Exercises of Ignatius*, in the *Introduction of Francis of Sales*, in the writings of Theresa of Jesus, of John of the Cross, of Blaise Pascal, lastly, for we must end, of Thérèse de Lisieux. By such as these it has been expressed in word; in deed and in life it has been and is being expressed by millions beyond number. It will be so expressed until the end of time.

On this note, Père de Grandmaison concludes. He tells us at the end that he is convinced not only that many loyal Christians do not realize enough the grandeur of the faith that is in them, but that many anti-Christians are what they are simply and solely because they do not know what it is that they oppose. For both of these he has written. He has laid the dust; he has cleared the ground; but beyond this he cannot go. For the rest, he who would know the truth of Jesus Christ must proceed for himself, and drink himself at the very source. And if he will proceed he will find far more than ever he could have conceived.

Père de Grandmaison has gone to his reward. He has left us this, as it were his last will and testament, certainly the crowning work of his life:

“Monumentum aere perennius.”

The fruit it has already borne, and will yet bear, he has not known. He has his reward in better form.

“Thou hast written well of Me, Thomas. What reward wilt thou have?”

“None, Lord, but Thyself.”

In this, as in other ways, he has proved himself a worthy disciple of Aquinas.

✠ ALBAN GOODIER.

PSYCHOLOGICAL HISTORY¹

THE eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were a period of considerable, if rather self-conscious, scholarship. There was doubtless a certain amount of pretentiousness; men of slight knowledge and no originality often won a position by "editing" the works of others. Still the sum of genuine learning was immense; the amount of deep and original work put forth, very great.

And it was comparatively easy for the reader of those days to test the learning of the writer. Open a history, memoirs, a biography, and you find every page adorned with footnotes, while introduction and appendices give all necessary references and supply the reasons for the author's view on all doubtful points. In such a book as Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, the cross references are so well done that, if we want to find out Johnson's view on any subject, we have no difficulty in running through the eight or twelve volumes in as many minutes and assembling all he ever said about it.

So strong was this fashion for notes and references that it affected even the fiction of the period. It may have been partly the cast of his own mind, intensely interested by concrete reality, but certainly it was too the spirit of his age that guided Sir Walter Scott in this matter. Each of his great romances can help the student of the period to a remarkable degree, for Sir Walter in voluminous prefaces and lengthy appendices tells us exactly where and why he departs from historical accuracy, (that is, of course, when he knew what it was!) or in the Scottish novels recounts the Border or Highland histories on which he has based his plots, describes the famous local characters whom he has used as heroes. *Rob Roy*, *Jeanie Deans*, *Dirk Hatterick* were not, Scott tells us, the creation of his own powerful imagination: he is scrupulous in acknowledging, not merely their origin in fact, but even the very places where his great scenes are founded on something they actually said or did. Sir Walter rescued from oblivion some of the most vivid actions and words of his countrymen, and it is certainly not his fault that they live for posterity solely as a part of his work and a testimony to his genius.

¹ "The Son of Man," by Emil Ludwig. "The Life of Jesus," by Ernest Renan. Everyman Library.

For the historian, the biographer, the scripture critic of those days, there was always one foremost question: had the sources been interrogated? What was the authority for this or that statement? And Catholics were often reproached because they wrote the saints' lives without enough regard for these first principles of learning. The critical world mocked if a story was told which first appeared long after the saint's death: it asked to be given the authority on which any part of the biography rested.

We see to-day a very remarkable reaction against this outlook of a century ago. Great classical scholars remark that they detest footnotes. Responsible historians write without references or appendices. Contrast, as an example, the *History of England* by Lingard and that by Belloc, the one annotated on every page, the other with hardly a reference throughout. Contrast Boswell's "*Johnson*" with Ludwig's "*Kaiser Wilhelm*." Finally contrast Bertrand's "*St. Augustine*" with any one of Sir Walter's historical novels. Yes, for it has come to this: that the modern biographer feels it less necessary to indicate his sources than did the old romancer.

It may be that there is good as well as bad in this reaction. The fashion of over-loading a work with references and arguments on disputed points made perhaps heavy reading—and at times it was used to cover real literary deceits. Bishop Gore has accurately described Renan's "*Vie de Jésus*" as a "romance based very loosely on history," yet Renan certainly pretended in a preface and notes to be making full use of the sources. But in this very book we see too the advantage of the old system. Critics of his own day poured contempt on Renan for the fashion in which he treated the documents, so that he was obliged to defend himself by additional explanations in later editions, until even the ordinary reader could find in the book itself the material for its condemnation.

Doubtless the man of learning can still form a just estimate of a book although it be devoid of notes, index, introduction, appendices. But even for him this will be a task of far greater labour and, for the man-in-the-street, one almost impossible. A certain amount of previous knowledge becomes essential, if we are even to guess at the general accuracy of the pictures drawn in the biographies and histories of to-day.

Thus, the suspicious reader is inclined to question everything he did not already know, while the simpler minded will accept ungrounded assertions. So the method has a double drawback: what is really accurate may be discredited; what is entirely imaginary may be accepted.

If footnotes worry the eye and interrupt the run of a narrative, let something better be found to fill the same purpose. For after all they did have a purpose.

Although Renan was somewhat under the old influences, there is no doubt that he was one of the first to popularize this new method of writing. In the "Vie Populaire" he dispensed even with those references he had given in his larger work. And in the most recent translation of his "Vie de Jésus" into English, the tell-tale references, notes and critical appendix are all cut out, while the Introduction is much shortened—anyhow, in comparison with that printed in the thirteenth or "definitive" French edition.

Charles Guignebert in the *Revue Historique*, said of Père Lagrange's brilliant demolition of Renan's "Vie de Jésus": "I do not know why he has taken this trouble, for to-day there is nobody, I suppose, to be found to defend the "Vie de Jésus" from the point of view of science." Bishop Gore, in his preface to the translation of Renan published by the "Everyman Library," quotes this dictum with approval, yet this translation and the preface itself seem to furnish quite an adequate answer to Guignebert's question.

Why has the "Everyman Library" issued another English translation of this book? Why had the French "Vie de Jésus" gone through 52 editions by 1926 and the "Vie Populaire" 20 editions? Why did a Christian think fit to furnish a preface to this new English edition in which he calls the book a romance and points out its unhistorical character?

Renan's book may be condemned by the critics, but it is eagerly devoured by the populace. For one who has read the ponderous demolition of the work by a German, probably a hundred have read the book without knowing that it has ever been demolished. For Renan, as Père Lagrange has pointed out, marked a new departure in scripture criticism. He was the first to offer that criticism to the man-in-the-street,

¹ "Christ and Renan," by Père Lagrange, O.P. (Sheed and Ward : 3s. 6d.)

backed by all his learning, his knowledge of the East, and his literary charm.

Instead of boring his readers with long discussions of individual texts he chose what he liked and left what he disliked, using as his guide the "idea of a living organism," a "profound sentiment," "some share of divination and conjecture," "the method of Art." Over all that is inexplicable in a naturalist explanation of Our Lord's life and character is thrown a veil of "atmosphere"—we should understand it perfectly if we had, like Renan, lived in the East and studied orientals.

This fashion of writing, begun by Renan, by no means ended with him. His success with the populace inaugurated a whole era of what we may call "psychological" biographies and "atmospheric" histories. Partly from a reaction against German criticism, while some outward show of respect is still shown to the documents, they are wholly disregarded whenever the author is pleased to find them untrue to his subject's psychology, inartistic or out of the atmosphere. A very recent attempt at a naturalistic life of Christ, shows us how far this fashion has gone and also how great is the influence of Renan's book on later writers.

Even those who read Father Woodlock's analysis of "The Son of Man" in the June number of *THE MONTH*, or those who read parts of the book itself while it appeared serially in the *Daily Express*, may not have realized fully how completely it is a re-hash of Renan's more famous work. In one respect this is very curious, since Ludwig declares that he relies chiefly on the Synoptic Gospels (the usual attitude of criticism) while Renan warmly defended his own dependence on St. John. But indeed, doctrinaire as Renan is in his treatment of the documents, he does show close knowledge of them. Ludwig gives an impression of never having read the Gospels through and of not knowing in which Evangelist the various events are to be found. Thus, to take only a single instance, that one who relies on the Synoptics should reject St. Luke's story of Christ and the doctors in the Temple, while inserting St. John's of the Marriage Feast at Cana, would seem at least to call for some explanation. But perhaps we Catholics only feel like that because we do not understand "psychology" and "Art"!

For Renan's main claim, which Ludwig has eagerly

adopted, is to get rid of difficulties, not by a patient study and comparison of the various records, but by using Art and psychology as constituting an unerring guide and rejecting everything which is not in accord with "the Idea." When this is done both writers tell us, with some simplicity, all difficulties disappear and we arrive (according to Renan) at "a superior truth," "more true than the naked truth."

This clue to the labyrinth, a labyrinth which is only there because the supernatural has to be avoided by the use if need be of most intricate bypaths, is Renan's chief gift to his German disciple. But he guides him also in many details of the story. From Renan, Ludwig borrows the idea of two great periods in Our Lord's life. The "Charmer of Galilee" in the "Vie de Jésus" became "the sombre giant," Christ's claims grew as the opposition against Him developed. And in Ludwig,—"These foes burden his spirit. They drive his self-confidence from its secret recesses, till, multiplied a thousand-fold, it becomes overweening, humility gives place to an assumption of royal bearing; and the Son of Man comes to regard himself as the Son of God."

From Renan, Ludwig learned that "the role of miraculous healer" was "thrust upon" Our Lord by His followers.

From Renan, Ludwig learned (for we read it in no one of the gospels) that the foes of Christ "go to and fro, therefore, saying that the new rabbi lures women away from domestic duties."¹

From Renan, Ludwig learned that "Mary of Magdala was the first to make Jesus immortal by her dream of His resurrection." Renan, more poetical, calls it her "strong imagination" and adds "Sacred moments in which the passion of one possessed gave to the world a resuscitated God." Ludwig in fact finds in Renan what Renan found in the Orient—a fifth gospel—which he constantly makes use of, though he nowhere acknowledges it.

From Renan, Ludwig learned a general idea of John the Baptist "pining away in prison" while "Jesus was said to be often in merry mood." Many pages are devoted in both books to the picture of this contrast and each writer makes his own use of the guide of Art and Psychology to imagine the effect of Christ and John on each other. Both write down

¹ Ludwig gives no reference. Renan referred his readers to an interpolation made by Marcion, which finds no place in any accepted MS.

this psychological idea as a part of the history, although Ludwig does not here follow Renan in every particular, and neither follow the gospels.

From Renan, Ludwig got the idea of relating a whole early period of Christ's life unknown to any document. Each tells it vividly, picturesquely,—but many features of the two stories differ. In both books Christ is said to dwell at Nazareth with a family of brothers and sisters.¹ In both books the boy lies on the hill-side, while dreams flit through his head—but here the books part company, and the dreams are different. One makes Him begin His ministry while the other still sees Him in the cottage at Nazareth.

Here even the man-in-the-street who has read both books may perceive one faint disadvantage in the method of psychology and atmosphere. If it alters facts completely, what becomes of History? "The Idea" may serve as a guide in interpreting facts, but it can scarcely be used in writing History if it leads to their suppression or invention. No Catholic hagiographer has ever ventured to invent in the name of sanctity or the supernatural as these men invent in the name of psychology and atmosphere.

In the period between the appearance of these two books one change has taken place which has rendered Père Lagrange's work particularly opportune. Bishop Gore speaks of "the clamours or shrieks" of the orthodox upon the appearance of the "Vie de Jésus." It may be true that "clamours or shrieks" serve no useful purpose, but God's thunders sounded of old and His punishments fell when the Ark of the Covenant was violated, and it seems natural that Christians should cry out in pain when what is far more sacred is blasphemed.

But fundamentally the question is not one of tone of voice. In England the attitude of religious men outside the Catholic Church has undergone a profound alteration. When the "Vie de Jésus" first appeared, horror at a blasphemy was as widespread in this country as in France. When Ludwig's "Son of Man" was appearing in the *Daily Express*, there were on the other hand many letters of congratulation from ministers of religion. Ludwig and Renan both profess to

¹ Renan admits that all the "brethren" mentioned in *any* of the Gospels were really our Lord's cousins, and yet insists on the existence of other brethren who have "remained obscure"!! Ludwig does not even seem to know that the "fact" is disputed.

avoid theology—which means in each case that they confine themselves to viewing Christ as a man—and thus viewing Him they fail to make of Him even a noble human character, for they suppose Him to at least participate in a fraud by accepting the responsibility of imaginary miracles. The failure is best summed up in the words of Père Lagrange, "The Jesus of liberal Protestantism could be admired, for He made no superhuman claims. The Jesus of Catholics is to be adored for He is, as He claimed to be, the true Son of God. The Jesus of Renan whom he offers for our admiration . . . should inspire only contempt or pity."

It can surely be only a generation that has ceased to read the gospels which can receive these pictures with enthusiasm. So far from Renan's book having ceased to be a danger, it is probably to-day more dangerous than ever before. The critics may not take it seriously, but Ludwig has taken it so seriously as to base upon it a book that has been widely read in England and we imagine in Germany also. It is written for the man-in-the-street, and to him it makes its appeal. Renan too stands before the same tribunal. If, by his fair yet pitiless analysis, a profound scholar like Père Lagrange has presented in popular fashion the reasons for a condemnation of such books—reasons common to the impartial scholar and the Catholic—he has surely done us a service. If in doing so he sends many readers back to the sources,—back to those neglected works of genius, the four authentic biographies of Christ by the men who had known and loved Him—he will have made the acceptance of such books as the "Vie de Jésus" and the "Son of Man" impossible in this and future generations.

M. J. SHEED.

VANISHING RELICS OF CATHOLIC ENGLAND

THE recent break-up of Ashridge Park, and the utilizing of its noble and historic mansion for other purposes, is a reminder that former abbeys, and abbey-sites, can still be bought in England. Estate-sales, year by year, and almost month by month, record the passage from hand to hand of one-time religious edifices that figured in the Middle Ages as centres of faith and pilgrimage. The following is a typical announcement, taken from the *Times* in August of the present year:

MINSTER ABBEY, an Isle of Thanet property, near Ramsgate, is for sale, the history of which can be traced from the eighth century The house occupies the site of the monastery of Edburga. The Abbey came into being as an act of expiation for the slaying of two possible rivals for the "throne of Kent." Norman work can be seen (in the present structure), and in the garden is a tower which incorporates a Norman carving of St. Augustine blessing the Angles. There are the monastic fishponds and the manorial barn, a specimen of old timbering.

It may not be inappropriate to give a representative list of Sales of Pre-Reformation religious buildings and estates which during the past four years have been sold in open market. It will indicate how largely the piety of our ancestors showed itself in dedicating their material goods to God's service.

1925.	Wilmington Priory, Sussex.	Founded in the reign of Rufus. Benedictine establishment.
	Penwortham Priory, near Preston.	Founded in Norman times. Benedictine establishment of great importance.
	A Sixteenth Century Priory.	Unnamed. Two miles from Shaftesbury.
	Haverholme Priory, Lincs.	Estate the property of the Cistercians in 12th century.
	Chertsey Abbey Lodge.	Occupies part of site of Benedictine Abbey, founded 666.
1926.	Chantrey House, Billericay.	Founded 1367 as meeting-place for priests.
	Anglesey Abbey, Newmarket.	Incorporates church building of 12th century.

1926.	A Sixteenth Century Abbey. Thornham Friars' House, near Maidstone.	Augustine establishment. Near Reading.
1927.	Rowney Priory, Great Munden. Burnham Abbey, near Taplow. Bruern Abbey, Oxon.	Site of Benedictine Nunnery, founded in 12th century.
	Okeburn Priory Estate, nr. Swindon. Lilleshall Abbey, border of Shropshire and Staffs. Cleeve Abbey, West Somerset.	Occupies site of 12th century Cistercian Abbey. Priory founded 1149. Founded in 1145 for Augustinian canons. Founded in 12th century as a Cistercian Abbey.
1928.	Stoke College, Suffolk. Monk Bretton Priory, Barnsley. Oratory at Rhôs-on-Sea.	Originally a Benedictine Priory, and later a College of Canons.
	Woodspring Priory, Somerset. The Priory, Bodmin, Cornwall.	Founded by Cistercian monks in 12th century. Founded 1210 by Robert de Courtenay.
	Thremhall Priory, Herts. Warter Priory, Yorkshire.	Built on site of St. Petrock's Priory, 12th century House of Canons Regular of St. Augustine. Site of 12th century Augustinian establishment. Site of Priory, founded 1132.
	Ulverscroft Priory, Charnwood Forest.	

As a variation from the "sale by auction" of Pre-Reformation abbeys or their sites, it is not exceptional to find former ecclesiastical buildings advertised as: "To be Let furnished." An important example is that of Flaxley Abbey in the Forest of Dean, founded in the middle of the twelfth century as a Cistercian establishment. The Abbot's Lodgings remain, with other portions of the monastic property which are remarkably interesting. The advertisement referred to appeared in April, 1927.

The properties announced for sale are but a fraction of the former religious edifices which, mutilated and dismembered at the Dissolution, are now put to secular uses. It must suffice to name a few, chosen at random from the scores which dot the countryside.

The gatehouse of Polesworth Abbey, near Tamworth, is used as a Parish club-room. University College at Reading occupies part of the dorter of the Hospitium of St. John; and a portion of the Priory of St. Mary is incorporated into

Totnes Guildhall. At Stoneleigh (Warwickshire) the gatehouse of the abbey is an Estate Office. Portbury Priory (Somerset) does service as a school, and the leper hospital of St. Bartholomew at Bristol is used as a printing house. The workhouse of Leominster includes a portion of the abbey: while the workhouse at Coventry is the cloister of the Carmelite Friary. The chapels of St. Tecla in the Severn, and St. Nicholas at Ilfracombe have been converted into lighthouses. The "Abbey Hotel" at Llanthony (Mon.) was actually the Prior's Lodgings: and the cloister-garth of Great Malvern Priory forms an hotel grounds. The "White Lion" at Malmesbury, the "George" at Glastonbury, and the "Bells" of Hurley and Tewkesbury are the guest-houses of the famous abbeys.

Where former religious buildings are used as dwelling-houses they possibly have been best preserved. Garsdon Manor and Cole Park were once granges of Malmesbury Abbey. Part of Bruton Abbey is used as a vicarage. The abbeys of Ford, Torre, Lacock, Neath, Beaulieu, Battle, and Bury St. Edmunds are now adapted as private mansions. The Prior's Lodgings at Little Malvern, monastic remains at Tavistock, the base of one of the towers of the great Benedictine Abbey of Coventry, are lived in. Farmhouses account for a considerable proportion. Among the buildings so used are the "old Saxon Chapel" at Deerhurst: the Abbot's house at Muchelney: the frater of Kemmer Priory (Merioneth): and monastic remains at Wigmore, Halesowen, Usk, Maxstone, Cornworthy, and St. Dogmæls. At Woodspring, (mentioned above), and at Staverdale the churches of the old priories remain, being used as barns and farm-houses. Nothing is more pitiable in all England than the fragment of the vast Abbotbury Abbey, in Dorset, now used as a barn, in which tradition places the starving to death of the last Abbot at the Dissolution. Bradenstoke Priory, near Malmesbury, to quote another example, is loneliness personified. "The remains are to be found at a farm on the top of a hill," says a recent eye-witness, "consisting of the wall of some building of the priory built into the present house, and of little else, the whole surrounded by a farmyard. Ruins such as these, which cannot inspire respect, would be much better out of existence. The whole place is disappointing and depressing." One sympathizes with the sentiment of Mr. Ernest Walls,¹ though his conclusions one could

¹ "The Bristol Avon." Page 127.

not for a moment allow. It is interesting to learn that some restoration is contemplated of the west range of the cloister buildings, with the Prior's parlour, with a view to making same a dwelling-house; and that the wonderful fireplace, which was long ago carted away to Corsham, has been again put back.

It is a curious anomaly that under the Ancient Monuments Consolidation and Amendment Act of 1913, inhabited houses, though of national importance, cannot be scheduled for preservation; and such a fact must leave some doubt as to the ultimate safety of many Pre-Reformation religious houses. The development of one-time rural areas, now proceeding apace, is bound, too, to take its toll. The fate of the Old Rectory Estate at Enfield is indicative of what is happening everywhere. This rectory originally belonged to the Benedictine monks of Hurley, and came under the supervision of the Abbey of Walden. At the Dissolution the estate passed to Trinity College, Cambridge. It has now been sold, and one hundred houses are to be erected on the site. Newstead Abbey, Notts, founded by Henry the Second, has been sacrificed likewise to building needs, for the fine old pile has been divided into flats. In addition, the demand for old oak, and historic relics, must tend increasingly to react upon the situation. The sale of Warwick Priory, founded in 1124 by the then Earl of Warwick, and the shipment of its noble timbers to America is a case in point: but a more recent one is that of the mansion known as "Whitehall" on the outskirts of Shrewsbury. The building stands on land which formerly belonged to Shrewsbury Abbey, and the outer walls of red sandstone, the great barn-building with its massive roof, and the round-headed gateway with many another relic, came from the great abbey itself. The mansion was negotiated for sale in 1927, (much, however, it must be admitted, against the natural inclination of the owner). The possibility of imminent destruction has confronted, lately, another building of historic note, the famous Friary House at Nottingham. The house contains a priest's hiding-hole, a secret chamber, and a subterranean passage, and is believed to have given shelter to Wolsey on his last painful journey to Leicester Abbey.

So much for private occupation of old monastic property. Much less safe are such goods when commerce has laid hands on them.

A recent example of importance is that of the Chapel of St. Anne-in-the-Wood at Brislington, near Bristol. The shrine, founded by the Lords de la Warre, about 1392, was well known throughout England in the Middle Ages as a place of pilgrimage, and Breton sailors actually were wont to visit the site as late as 1880. At the Dissolution, the treasures of the chapel were abstracted, and its walls used as a quarry for a farmhouse. When the foundations were uncovered by Mr. W. J. Pountney in 1914, there were revealed, among other relics, the Chapel Vault, monks' stairs, fragments of the great East Window and of the gilded Tabernacle of St. Anne, together with ruins of a guest-house and monks' cells. In recent years a large Mill-Board Company acquired a portion of the valley around the site, and fears were raised that the foundations and the graveyard might be built over. Requests made to the Company to schedule the land as a perpetual open space, and to repoint the ruins *in situ*, have been unfortunately without avail; and it is now announced officially that "it is probable that at no very future date the land will be required for building extensions in connection with our industry, and for the benefit of our employees."

It would be foolish to regard all this traffic in what once was consecrated to God as in any way sacrilegious. On the restoration of England to Catholic unity under Mary, Cardinal Pole, the Pope's representative, abandoned the Church's claim to most of her stolen property. And it may be conjectured that even had the "Great Pillage" not taken place, the growth of population would in time have caused the breaking up of the extensive ecclesiastical holdings. Even so, however, religious sentiment will still cling to those religious properties, especially to those "bare, ruined quires where late the sweet birds sang," the derelict Abbeys and Priories. Happily, within the last few years an increasing number of ruined abbeys have been entrusted to the keeping of the Office of Works, and thus safeguarded from further disintegration. Outstanding among the number are Kirkham, Byland, Rievaulx, Whitby, Roche, Titchfield, Furness, Jedburgh, Kelso, Melrose, Netley, Buildwas, and Tintern. The National Trust has undertaken the guardianship of the Abbey Gate, Minster, Isle of Sheppey, built by William de Corbeuil, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1123-1139; and Westbury College Gateway, Bristol. The Sussex Archaeological Trust has, likewise, excavated and restored the Priory at Wilming-

ton, near Eastbourne, presented to it by the Duke of Devonshire. Important among other gifts of abbeys to the public is that of the Abbey of Lincluden, near Dumfries, a priory for Benedictine nuns which dates back to the twelfth century. The donor is the Duchess of Norfolk.

Instances, happily, are not lacking of an awakened interest on the part of Corporations and public bodies in the religious edifices which have fallen into their hands. At Stratford-on-Avon, attention has been given to the beautiful chapel of the Guild-of-the-Holy-Cross founded in 1296: at Bradford-on-Avon to the Blind House on the Bridge, anciently a chapel, or Mass House: and at Dover to the Maison Dieu Hall, built as a rest-house in 1203 for pilgrims from the Continent proceeding to the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket, at Canterbury. The Corporation of Bristol restored in 1924 the Holy Well of St. Anne, and has more recently placed an explanatory tablet beside it. In September of the present year the Hendon Rural District Council purchased the moated farmhouse of Headstone Manor, between Harrow and Pinner, to save it from building developments. The farmhouse, to which is attached a huge tithe-barn of the fifteenth century, was used as early as the middle fourteenth century as a quiet house of rest for the Archbishops of Canterbury. Godstow Nunnery, near Oxford, consecrated in 1138, which seemed threatened with almost complete obliteration, has now been presented to Oxford University, and its further preservation is assured. Kingswood Abbey Gateway, (near Wotton-under-Edge) now undergoing restoration, is an example of how the sympathetic care of trustees and guardians may hand down to posterity a monastic relic of the past.

How a one-time monastic property was preserved by reverting to a different religious body, is instanced by Sturry Court, two miles from Canterbury Cathedral, and the country home of the late Lord Milner. The house occupies a site which from the days of King Ethelbert to the reign of Henry the Eighth belonged to St. Augustine's Monastery, and furnished the residence to which the last Abbot retired in 1538. Ancient walls, gateways, tithe-barns, etc., exist, and the meadows by the water's edge are as peaceful as when the old-time monks paced by in meditation. The Court was in 1926 bequeathed to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury Cathedral for the use of "King's School," Canterbury, which

claims an antiquity for its original foundation as early as the Cathedral itself, and which was for centuries presided over by the Abbot and his monks.

A gesture of far-reaching importance, since coming from a representative of the Catholic Church, was made last year by the Rev. Bernard Roe, Rector of St. Etheldreda, Ely Place, Holborn, a thirteenth century building erected as the private chapel of the London Palace of the Bishops of Ely, and the only church in the City of Pre-Reformation days which has been restored to the worship of the Catholic Faith. The owners of adjoining properties sought to pull down a stone wall behind the church, which represents all that now remains of the ancient residential palace, claiming it to be a party wall so weakened by age that it would not safely support the new buildings to be erected. As a result of representations, supported by old documents, the Rector succeeded in showing that the stone wall was a relic worthy to be scheduled for preservation by the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, and eventually prevented the complete obliteration of a relic of no mean value.

A notable example of the restoration of a portion of a former religious house is seen at "Locus Dei," Hinton Charterhouse, (Somerset). Founded in 1232 by Ela Countess of Salisbury, as a Carthusian monastery, the church and cloisters were levelled at the Dissolution. Happily a portion of the Prior's Lodging was incorporated into the Tudor mansion built upon the site, and so escaped destruction. Another fragment, a rare and precious gem, remained uncared for until recent years. It has now been taken over and restored, and presents a picture of what it must have looked like when on March 31, 1539, the monks of "Locus Dei" were compelled to sign the Deed of Surrender. This gem was possibly the Lady Chapel. "It has a double piscina and shelf on the south side of the altar: and an aumbry on the north side. Above the chapel, up stone stairs, is the Library Room of the Monastery, or it may have been the Treasury. A door from it leads into a small dovecot. Upstairs again, above the Library, is the large dovecot of the monks, with its stone roof, just as they left it."¹ What possibly saved the building at the Dissolution is, that it was thought, perhaps, that doves and pigeons were useful! Lacock Abbey (Wilts.) founded by Countess Ela on the same day as "Locus Dei," is also in existence, though in private hands,

¹ "Locus Dei." By Rev. F. S. Gray, M.A. Pp. 6 and 8.

being one of the most perfect specimens of a house for Augustinian nuns remaining in the country.

Elsewhere the Catholic Church has shown herself not unmindful. At Deer in Aberdeenshire, where stands the ruined Cistercian Abbey of St. Mary, founded and endowed by William Comyn, Great Justiciary of Scotland in 1218-1219, the authorities have acquired the old monastic estate with a view to saving for all time what in the Middle Ages was an active centre of religious life. Pilgrimages have begun again to the old shrine, so reviving a custom discontinued for nearly four centuries. At the famous Whalley Abbey, seven miles north of Blackburn, the Church has purchased the noble two-storied building used in former days as the dwelling-house of the lay brethren. Only a stone's throw from the one-time splendid Abbey of Quarr, Isle of Wight, founded by Baldwin de Redvers for Benedictine monks but now a mutilated barn, Catholics have erected a great and noble abbey. The achievements of the monks of Buckfast are too well known to bear repetition. Here, in accordance with the great traditions of monastic building, there has come once more in being a vast abbey, restored as far as possible on the identical foundations and plans of the edifice levelled in the sixteenth century. Even the statue of Our-Lady-of-Buckfast, broken in pieces, has been recovered in part, and takes once more her niche of honour in the holy place. Nor must it be forgotten that though Glastonbury Abbey lies broken and in other hands, thirteen miles away, new, square and incomplete, rises the tower of Downside Abbey, where is lived to-day the same and the one life lived at Glastonbury for a thousand years. There is consolation, also, in the fact that the transference of the Benedictine monks of Caldey Island, near Tenby, to their new home at Prinknash Park, Gloucestershire which took place in September, may be set as compensation against the destruction in that county over three centuries before of another Benedictine Abbey, that of Winchcombe.

What may be the ultimate fate of many a score of former shrines, secularized and in private hands, only the future can decide. Some within the present century, as we have seen, must pass away, victims to industry, to fire, or to neglect, leaving not a trace behind them. But the memory of their former glory will remain as an eternal symbol of religious faith.

F. C. JONES.

A NEWSPAPER DEBATE ON THE BIBLE

THE Bible, wherever it is wrested from the guardianship of the Church, has met with a sad, if natural, fate. At first endowed by the Reformers with an authority which no dumb document could wield and supposed to be verbally inspired, it has gradually come to be denied by their descendants any authority at all. Bishop Gore has openly declared ¹ of the facts of revelation recorded in the New Testament:—"The judge of such facts is historical science: it is a new judge sitting in a new court"—thus setting up fallible and changing human opinion as the final interpreter of the revealed word. And latterly ministers of the Free Churches have advocated the rejection of large portions of the Old Testament as of no historical or religious value. Moreover, it is universally admitted that knowledge of the Bible, once commendably prevalent, has sunk to a very low ebb in Protestant England. However, a recent discussion in the *Daily Telegraph* has done something to revive interest in the subject and should serve incidentally to rehabilitate the trustworthiness of the Sacred Record in the eyes of those who have believed too blindly in "historical science." The columns of the paper were opened to a correspondence on Bible History introduced by two articles from the pen of Sir Charles Marston and carried on for several weeks by many contributors, a number bearing well-known names. Among these may be mentioned Sir Flinders Petrie, Professor Sayce, J. W. Crowfoot, Director of the British School of Archaeology at Jerusalem, Dr. Langdon, Professor of Assyriology at the University of Oxford, Mr. C. Leonard Woolley, Director of the Joint Expedition to Ur, and other public men. In view of the widespread interest aroused by these letters and the importance of the religious principles involved, it appears worth while to review some of the chief questions discussed and opinions expressed. If they are not, as Dr. Campbell Morgan put it, "finger-posts upon the highway of Biblical study and research," at any rate as indicating the way we should walk, at least they serve the useful purpose of showing the directions that minds of different types are now pursuing.

¹ *Church Times*, March 12, 1926, p. 309.

As in all similar symposia the discussion soon ranged over a wider field than that originally in view, which was the signal services rendered to Biblical study by excavations in Bible lands, but of course this topic received considerable attention and widely differing points of view came to light. Considerable stress was laid and justly on the many passages in which archaeology has shown the accuracy of the biblical narratives. Thus Professor Sayce wrote: "The old assumptions upon which the sceptical criticism of the past was founded have been shown to be baseless, and time after time ancient tradition has been vindicated and verified. Archaeological excavation has given us facts instead of theories." "We have begun," says Sir Flinders Petrie, "to obtain a solid basis for estimating the nature of the historical books of the Old Testament, and this material evidence is of very different texture and result to the suppositions of literary criticism." He points to "the value of such facts, recently discovered, as the abundance of iron—as common as at present in Palestine—at the early time when iron is described as freely used, and nine hundred chariots of iron are assigned to Hazor; the frequency of gold ornaments at the time when the Midianites are said to have had an abundance; or the personal decorations of the time of Solomon being far richer than were usual in Egypt or Babylon at that period. . . . Such physical facts in a past, where they would not otherwise be expected, show that the narratives belong to the time and deal with a real history in the books of Joshua, Judges, and Kings." In this way archaeology has time and again shown that attacks on the historical veracity of the Bible have been quite unfounded. Still "one thing archaeology cannot do," in the words of Mr. Woolley, "it cannot 'prove the truth' of the Bible in the sense which some people seem to demand of it; that is, it cannot prove just that element in the Bible which for most people sets this book above other books." This, of course, should be obvious enough. The spade can only bring to light the material remains of vanished civilizations. It can demonstrate the accuracy of many of the historical details narrated in the Bible, it can persuade us of its historical trustworthiness, as it can do in the case of other ancient records, it cannot prove that those records were inspired. To those who believe in this inspiration, the treasures unearthed in the Tells that mark the sites of ancient cities provide conclusive refutations of the

unwarranted denials of the sceptical, but they will not persuade the unbeliever to regard the Scriptures as divinely inspired. Besides this valuable function of archaeology in vindicating the trustworthiness of the Bible, which alone would induce every believer to further excavations by all means in his power, the spade may sometimes help us to understand the real sense of Scripture in an obscure passage. An example of this may be cited from 4 Kings xxiii. 29 where we read that in the days of King Josias "Pharao Necho king of Egypt went up against the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates," but tablets recently published by Mr. Gadd show that the word here translated "against" has been taken in a sense it does not necessarily bear, and that the true sense is here merely that of direction, as the intentions of the Egyptian king were not hostile to Assyria. The results of excavations moreover enable us to visualize ancient history with a distinctness impossible without the possession of actual remains of the races whose deeds it records. We are, for example, no longer under any illusion as to the dimensions of the old city stronghold. "Everyone would agree that Troy was an important city; yet that focus of trade would have fitted into Hanover-square—the smallest in London" (Petrie). The city of the Jebusites, that was captured by David, was less than two hundred feet across from east to west, as is now clear from the recent labours of Mr. Crowfoot and others.

The benefits of excavation to sacred science seem too obvious to need elucidation, yet some writers speak of it in rather disparaging terms. "I fail to see how the archaeological discoveries in Palestine, Assyria and Egypt can either enhance or lower the value of the Bible. The biblical narratives are of two kinds—the probable and the improbable. The first do not require archaeological corroboration, and the second do not receive it." The force of the argument is not obvious. The probable may be converted into a certainty, and the improbable equally may turn out to be a fact. A true dictum too often forgotten is that of Aristotle—it is highly probable that the improbable will sometimes happen. Too frequently the arguments of critics supporting their rearrangement of biblical history are based upon a rejection of the improbable; and besides it must not be forgotten that the estimate of the improbable is largely subjective.

The traditionalist, as he is called, who believes that the Bible is the Word of God, that therefore its text, when certainly known and correctly understood, is infallibly true,

knows that the spade can never unearth any fact that can conflict with its statements, yet we are assured by a Unitarian Minister, the Rev. G. L. Parker, that "the spade might prove or disprove any number of books in the Old Testament without having one iota of effect on the truth of St. Luke's Gospel or the spiritual value of Ephesians," and again, "what is proven for one portion, except in the most general way, neither proves nor disproves anything about another portion." These sentences are clearly prompted by a view of the Bible far removed from the Catholic doctrine of inspiration. Indeed Mr. Parker tells us that the books of the Bible "vary in inspiration." On Catholic principles the books of the Bible can and do vary in the extent to which they embody revelation; they cannot vary in inspiration. Either they are the Word of God or they are not. "It should also be frankly stated," Mr. Parker goes on, "that to speak of 'the inspiration of the Bible' is misleading. Behind the Book of Leviticus there may indeed lie a sublime and inspired purpose, but plainly it is not the same sort of inspiration that breathes in the tender words of Jesus, nor in the heart-throb of many of the Psalms, nor in the thought of Paul. As a matter of fact, one gets inspiration from Paul and the Psalms and the words of Jesus that one cannot possibly get from Leviticus; and to get inspiration is a far more important proof of it than to certify it by spade or argument." In other words the Scriptures are not inspired in the traditional and theological sense of the word. Such sentences help one to appreciate the care and accuracy with which our theological writers define their words, and distinguish their different meanings. Mr. Parker is much impressed by the fact that "the 'Bible' is not one book, but a library of sixty-six books"; but he appears to have overlooked the interdependence of these books. How, to take his own example, could any number of the books of the Old Testament be "disproved" without having one iota of effect on St. Luke's Gospel, when we have it on the authority of St. Luke that Christ "beginning at Moses and all the prophets expounded . . . in all the scriptures the things that were concerning him" (xxiv. 27). The only Scriptures then written were the books of the Old Testament. If we accept the authority of Luke, we cannot let the Old Testament go.

Dr. Robinson, Lecturer in Semitic Languages at University College, Cardiff, assures us that the Higher Critic "normally believes in the inspiration of Scripture, and regards prophecy as a statement of eternal truth valid for past, present,

and future." This should be a comforting saying for Traditionalists. It is certainly a surprising one, and the varying use of the word *inspiration* raises doubt in the mind as to the meaning here intended. Certainly those dignified by the name of higher critics do not uphold the inerrancy of the Bible, and that is inseparable from the Catholic concept of *inspiration*. Whatever we may be asked to believe about the critics, a number, as was only to be expected, of those contributing to this discussion stated frankly their rejection of all *inspiration*. They will admit that the Bible is "a marvellous work," and "unsurpassed in beauty of language, high moral tone, and grandeur of thought," but assert categorically as a "fact" that "the 'prophets' of old were no more 'inspired' than present-day preachers." It is not uninteresting to notice that the author of the last-quoted dogmatic utterance does not consider that his pronouncement has need of the support of arguments or reasons. The varying use of the word *inspiration* is much to be regretted. Bishop Welldon apparently uses it in the sense of *revelation*. "It is necessary to make a distinction," he writes, "between the Old and the New Testaments. No well-informed scholar would now maintain that the whole Bible from Genesis to Revelation, is equally inspired by the Almighty." The Dean's meaning would appear to be that revealed truth is not manifested equally throughout the Bible. The more so, as he proceeds: "His *revelation* is progressive: it is therefore incomplete in its early parts." There is, of course, a fundamental difference between *inspiration* and *revelation*. By the former Almighty God makes Himself chief author of the Bible; by the latter He makes known some truth. Books containing *revelation* may not be *inspired*, as for instance modern manuals of devotion; on the other hand it is possible for an *inspired* book to contain no *revelation*. Such would appear to be the case with the second book of Machabees. See ch. ii. v. 24. There is, moreover, apt to be some confusion over the expression "verbal *inspiration*." The Catholic theologian distinguishes *inspiration* into verbal and non-verbal. The opinion generally held in the Church to-day is that the *Scriptures* were not verbally *inspired*, that is to say, that they were *inspired*, but that *inspiration* did not extend to the fixing by Almighty God of each and every word. He inspired the substance of what was to be written, but left the determination of the individual words to the human writer. However it is worth remarking that in the mouths of many outside the

Church to say that the Scriptures are not verbally inspired is tantamount to saying that they are not inspired at all.

It will be of interest now to examine the grounds alleged by some of the writers for the inspiration of Scripture and the genuineness of its prophecies. Thus Sir Charles Marston writes :—" When we come to think about it, the continued survival and the growing prosperity of the Jewish race are in themselves evidence of the genuineness of Old Testament prophecy. For it passes the audacity of a Higher Critic to date these predictions of Scripture now being fulfilled before our very eyes as late as our own times !" This idea found favour with at least one other writer. Unfortunately neither give any reference to show on what texts they found this assertion. Certainly prophecy as regards the Jews extends to the Messianic age, for there is the famous prophecy of the conversion of the Jews at its close, but it would be difficult to point to any prediction of their material prosperity during its course. A persuasive argument, one that prepares the mind for other considerations may be found in the unique influence exercised by the Bible on the minds of men through the ages : " The Bible has had its own subsequent history in the way of effective influence on all sorts and conditions of men in its journeyings down through the centuries to the present day. Here again the Bible is unique in this long train of corroborative evidence, as to its numinous quality, through its impact, so to speak, on the mind of mankind, and its power in awaking and developing the religious consciousness. The whole of this constitutes a value which, as it is more and more realized, will, perhaps, complete the circle and lead back again to an even reinforced claim for the Bible as inspired." A clergyman writes in the same strain : " No one would dare to mention any book which has had an equal influence on the life of men and nations. However great the most notable authors and books that humanity has produced in the course of history, not one has ever had, or enjoys now, the enormous circulation of the Bible in hundreds of different tongues, and its influence on the old nations of the past and the young growing nations of the present is unique. The Bible proves conclusively its divine origin by the lives it has changed and its nothing less than miraculous effect on the characters of millions of human beings in all ages." The same writer proposes as the only criterion of inspiration the internal evidence of the Bible itself : " The only way to believe in the Bible is to

study it, with its history, types, and prophecies, with their marvellous interconnection. After years of reverent study, our confidence in its divine origin is only strengthened, and as we note its undiminished power to elevate, instruct, and purify men, we know this is 'The Word of God'." I quite agree with the Rev. W. B. R. Caley that reverent study of the Scriptures will more and more tend to confirm our faith; but study of the Bible is not the only way to gain belief in it. Many spend their time dissecting it, who seem to have no real belief in it at all, though Dr. Robinson, of Cardiff, assures us that the "critic necessarily believes in the Bible; he would not be so stupid as to spend his life over a forgery." He might devote his career to showing up the pretensions of a book that was exercising immense and, as he conceived, unwarranted influence on the lives of countless millions of men. And granting he might not be willing to spend his life on a forgery, many men are quite content to give their days and energies to the study of acknowledgedly human documents. It is the more remarkable that Dr. Robinson should express himself in this way as the higher critics in general consider that the book of Deuteronomy was written in the seventh century B.C., hid in the Temple, and then, though they would most certainly not use the word, foisted on a credulous people as the work of Moses. The critics do not style Deuteronomy a forgery, but is there any other word in the language that better expresses the character of a work composed as they contend that Deuteronomy was composed?

But to return, it seems to have escaped the notice of the Rev. W. B. R. Caley that all the books of the Bible do not claim their own inspiration, either individually or collectively. The inspiration of all the books of the Bible cannot be proved out of the Bible. The inspiration of certain books of the Old Testament is indicated in the New. But how do we know that this teaching of the New is to be accepted as certainly true? The books of the New Testament do not all claim, and still less prove their own inspiration. How then do we know that they are inspired, and are an infallibly true record of divine revelation? There can be no other answer except that we know this to be their character from the teaching of the Church. The Scripture documents have their own historical value independently of the Church; and by their historical testimony, considered apart from inspiration and on the same footing as any other historical document, they lead us to the Church. When we have come to know

the Church, its divine origin, its divinely appointed teaching office, then we learn from the Church what the true nature of these documents is. From the Church we learn, and from the Church alone can we learn, the complete list of the books inspired by Almighty God. It is significant that in the discussion under review the only reference to the authority of the Church came from one who openly rejects the infallibility of the Scriptures, and asks why the authorities in the fourth century should "be more in a position to decide which were to be treated as sacred writings and included in the Book than, say, our present-day Bishops?", presumably, that is, of the Church of England. The answer to this question would lead us beyond our present scope, but rests on the unchangeableness of truth, on the divine commission of the Church to teach unaltered the revealed Word of God, and on the history and human origin of the Church of England.

The critics, as we have seen, met with support in this correspondence; they were accorded also some shrewd criticism. Sir Charles Marston started with a reference to "the incautious pronouncements of those who have been regarded as scientific critics," and made an appeal to clear away the "scholastic débris enshrined in so many modern English commentaries." Then Sir Flinders Petrie wrote that "there have been too many absurdities and incessant contradictions of different critics for any decisive value to be attached to opinions"; and again, "any critical theory must first be tested on a known case, and only if it prove valid there, can we venture to use it to restore the unknown; for instance, if we apply the J. and E. theory of discrimination to a modern hymn-book it clearly will not separate the origins of writings." Professor Langdon, in his turn, writes: "On the side of pure philological criticism of the Hebrew texts there has been, and still is, a reckless tendency to 'correct' the Hebrew text when perfectly good Accadian cognate words exist to explain the words 'corrected' into something either impossible or erroneous." The Oxford Professor of Assyriology adds: "The splendid and scholarly achievements of Hebrew specialists are attended by an attitude all to sceptical about obvious facts," and it might be added, still more about statements of Scripture which in themselves do not possess more than intrinsic probability. Dr. Campbell Morgan, of the Westminster Congregational Church, expresses his opinion as follows: "'closed minds' are not peculiar to those who do not accept the conclusions of the critics who

deny Bible history. Many of these critics also have minds very closely closed. It is a most valuable thing therefore to call a halt, in order to consider indisputable evidence that their contentions are by no means proven."

The words of the Rev. A. H. Sayce, formerly Professor of Assyriology in the University of Oxford, are worthy of transcription at greater length from the necessarily ephemeral pages in which they appeared :—

In these days of specialization theologians and literary philologists still to a large extent confine themselves . . . to the pleasant pastime of " analysing " ancient Oriental records into their primeval atoms and duly assigning them to an array of imaginary authors. In my younger days it was much the same in the classical world. Homer had been resolved into a somewhat unskilfully combined collection of " lays " which the modern scholar had no difficulty in separating and ascribing to their separate dates, Greek and Roman history began with Pisistratus and the capture of Rome by the Gauls, and the heroes of Greek story were forms of the Sun-god. The classical world has learnt better to-day : it has accepted the results of archæological discovery ; the Homeric poems have been rehabilitated and Agamemnon and the siege of Troy have become historical realities. It is time that the theological world should follow the example of the classical scholar. The work of Schliemann and his successors shattered the huge edifice of ignorant scepticism and unproved fantasies and assumptions which had been erected over the so-called prehistoric age of Greece. For the follower of modern science the discovery of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets similarly shattered the fabric of the " Higher Criticism " of the Old Testament. We learned that the Mosaic Age was an age of literary activity and intercourse and that whatever obscurities there might be about its history, they could not be cleared away by the literary speculations of a European scholar who was neither an Oriental nor a participator in the culture and civilization of the Mosaic period.

One or two more quotations will serve to illustrate the fact that the critical position, if one may speak of it in the singular, has by no means captured public opinion. Mr. Woolley writes of " the attacks made on the Bible by the Modernist school," that " they relied very little on archæological support

and very much on *a priori* arguments, which later discoveries have discounted." The Rev. A. H. Finn speaks of the "utterly unsatisfactory methods of the critics." "They often," he says, "rely on unfounded assertions and assumptions; one-sided presentation of the evidence (selecting what favours and ignoring what is against their theory); circular arguments; forced interpretations; and insisting that what may be must be the only explanation. . . Modern Higher Critics may have assimilated archaeological results, but this has often been by quietly dropping assertions once freely made but now shown to be untenable."

The correspondence touched on several other questions of importance with which there is not space to deal in the present article. I hope to have an opportunity to refer to them later. I should like to close with an extract from the letter of "An Unlearned Clerk" :—

As the years have passed, we have seen how one generation of critics busies itself to discredit the opinions of the generation that has passed. But the mistakes of the predecessors do not make them less dogmatic in their turn, and induce no hesitant modesty. When an undergraduate I came under the influence of the late Professor Cheyne. He was a power in his time, a great Hebrew scholar and a lifelong student of the Bible. . . . What has become of his strange theories supported by such a wealth of argument and allusion? Does anyone now believe in the Jerochmiel theory by which the whole Bible came to mean something else? I well remember Professor Cheyne explaining that with the Jerochmiel theory as an interpretative key to the Old Testament the familiar though strange injunction, "Seethe not a kid in its mother's milk," became, "Let not a woman put on the garment of Jerochmielite."

Criticism has its proper function. No examination of everything that contributes to our knowledge of the Bible can be excessive. But it remains a comforting truth that though more acute minds have been directed to the investigation of Biblical problems than anything else in the world, the integrity of the Scriptures remains, and each new discovery tends to justify those who believe that in the Bible we have not only God's revelation to man, but a philosophy of life and cosmogony that. . . have never been overthrown or supplanted.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE.

THE CASE OF BLESSED CHRISTINA OF STOMMELN

II.

LEAVING Cologne about the third Sunday after Easter, 1269, Father Peter of Dacia took more than three weeks to reach Paris, where he remained until July 27th of the following year. During this and the subsequent period we are almost entirely dependent for our information upon the letters received from Stommeln which Peter has incorporated in his narrative. As previously stated, these letters seem, most of them, to have been written by John the parish priest, in the name of Christina, and we have sometimes a curious anticipation of a situation imagined by Miss Mary Webb in her remarkable novel "Precious Bane"—that is to say, the amanuensis occasionally loses sight of his proper function as a mere interpreter and breaks off into scraps of news or comments on his own behalf. Whether Peter has reproduced these letters faithfully, exactly as they were written, is a point of interest and a great puzzle. I confess I am strongly tempted to think that he has edited them. The Latin generally seems to be notably better than we should expect from the Plebanus of a small country parish, and we know that the mediæval conscience was far from sensitive in the matter of accurate transcription. The very veneration which the good young friar felt for his penitent may have led him to present her communications in the form which seemed to him to do most credit to her thought.

It is abundantly clear that the correspondence on both sides was of a most affectionate, even tender, character. Christina begins a letter, for example:—

To Father Peter of Dacia, most beloved in Christ Jesus, now in Paris, his child or sister at Stommeln wishes health and whatever he can desire that is best and most profitable in our Lord. Dearest, you ought to know that I am very anxious concerning you, and though I have often written, I cannot forbear to tell you once again how great my longing is to have you here, where your presence has been so helpful to me, and how in the bowels of Christ Jesus I crave for a sight of you, and how I hope that we shall meet face to face in the kingdom of our God.¹

¹ Ep. xiii. Paulson, "Scriptores Suecani," p. 100, ll. 37-41.

So Peter, on his side, begins :—

To his well-beloved, dearest among all more dear, most worthy of every tender name whether it be daughter, or sister, or friend, her own—as she may choose to term him, provided it be fitting in God's eyes—confidant, or friend, or crony (*intimus*), Brother Peter, wishes greeting and the eternal possession of the Beloved, whom she prizes above all.¹

Countless affectionate phrases occur in these letters which would perhaps surprise us now-a-days if we met them in the correspondence of a pious young woman of 25 with a newly-ordained priest and Religious not much older than herself. I do not know if nationality had anything to do with it, but there was a good deal of *Schwärmerei* in the character of both these aspirants after sanctity. This is the aspect of the case upon which M. Renan has mainly dwelt, but he suggests no thought of scandal. On the contrary, he tells us how "Peter would redouble his attempts at fine writing, loading his artificial style with high-sounding phrases, but being truthful and edifying in spite of all."² They seem to have taken every opportunity of sending each other presents. Peter had the prayer-book which the devil restored to her beautifully bound and illuminated. He also gave her a blouse (*tunica*) which she treasured so much that she only wore it on great festivals in order that it might serve her to the end of her life.³ Christina, on her side, sent him a hat (*pileus*) and a number of other things at different times. She had saved up ten shillings to provide for his little needs, but to her great distress the devil stole them and she seems never to have got them back. Her family at that time were becoming continually more impoverished, but she writes to him : "I pray you for the love of God that if there is anything I can send you you will let me know." When he was at Paris he received from her a "campana"—this usually means a bell, but probably was a name given to some sort of basket—full of vegetables for him to eat. When after a flying visit of farewell he finally left Stommeln for his own distant Sweden, we have from Peter's own pen a most touching description of their parting. A little company which included Christina, the Plebanus, his sister, Hilla vom Berge and some of the Dominicans, escorted

¹ Ep. x. Paulson, p. 92, ll. 25-29.

² E. Renan, "New Studies in Religious History" (Eng. Trans.), p. 344.

³ I should infer that on two different occasions he gave her a "tunica," and we also hear of another present of his, a "sanctuarium," apparently a reliquary.

him and his travelling companion for the first few miles of his journey. Christina and Peter seem to have drifted apart from the rest, and Peter says :—

As we two walked along side by side, sad and depressed over the separation that was now at hand and were exchanging sighs much more than spoken words, I said : “ Dearest Christina, the moment has come for us to part ; fare thee well in the Lord, O my dearest one ! ” And when she heard my words she made no answer, but she sank down there on the ground, and covered her face with her cloak, weeping most copiously and bitterly. ’

For two days, so she wrote to him afterwards, her tears flowed continually. Then the devil came and told her that Peter had been killed by robbers. She more than half believed it and spent a week of anguish, but our Lady herself—this is again Christina’s own statement in the same letter—appeared to her and set her mind at rest.¹ Let me repeat that when we find her beginning a letter at the same epoch, “ Caro, cariori, carissimo fratri . . . Christina sua tota,” and declaring “ desidero me solam esse vestri ” in the sense apparently that she wished to belong to him alone, so far as human aid was concerned, and to no one else,² there is not the slightest reason for supposing that there was anything in this friendship which was not as it should be. But it was all rather more human and emotional than what one expects to find conjoined with heroic sanctity, and Peter himself seems at the back of his mind to have had misgivings on the subject, for he writes on different occasions in such terms as the following :—

Although from time to time I have seen you and visited you, I never intended to centre your affections upon myself, or even to draw them towards myself. On the contrary, so far as I knew how, I have laboured by word and shown by my behaviour that you should give yourself wholly to Christ and to His embraces.

It seemed necessary to touch at least briefly upon the relations between Christina and her Dominican friend, for in view of the astounding experiences recorded in the period of her life with which we are now concerned, the presumption that she was temperamentally hysterical and unbalanced ought not to be left out of account. Though the horrible defilements of

¹ “Acta Sanctorum,” June, vol. IV., p. 314 C,D.

² *Ibid.*, p. 318 D,E.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 320 C, 318 E.

which Peter and his brethren had so often been eyewitnesses were now practically at an end,¹ the agency which tormented her, whether demon or poltergeist, did not apparently abandon the campaign after her friend withdrew to Paris. Some of the molestations which she described as assaults of the evil one were probably only the accidents of her pathological condition. She complains in her letters of being scorched with an intolerable heat, a heat which covered her own lips with blisters and which so radiated from her that it burnt the nose of Gertrude, the parish priest's sister, who shared the same bed and who in consequence refused to sleep with her in future. She further avers that the devil perforated her ears with a red-hot iron, and the Plebanus apparently believed that this was like a long skewer and that it passed right through her head from one side to the other.² We must infer, I think, that he was as simple as he was good and that he was prepared to credit anything which his penitent suggested to him. Similarly, when Father Gerard de Grifo reports, in a letter to Peter, that the devil came "*et sensibiliter lanceam infixit in ore*," and that thereupon Christina, "*as all who were present perceived, vomited a quantity of blood like that which flows from a freshly-made wound*," I do not think that we can suppose that the spectators saw any lance, much less the devil wielding it, but only that Christina being surprised by a sudden *hæmatemesis*, to which hysterical subjects are very liable,³ believed that the devil had physically smitten her in the throat. When her nose bled on another occasion during her prayer-time, she seems to have been equally persuaded that the demon had struck her with some iron implement (*quando orabam, cum ferro læsit me in nasum ad sanguinis effusionem*).⁴ But there were other manifestations at the same period which have strongly marked poltergeist affinities. Christina wrote at large about these in the letter which is numbered vii.; but no more than a summary is possible here.

She tells us that at the beginning of Advent, 1269, the devil came and smashed in the door of her room with such violence that those who were present thought that the house was tumbling down. Later, he brought in a skull, with which he made

¹ There was, however, an occasional recurrence; see Paulson, "Scriptores Suecani," p. 83, ll. 14-15 and 27.

² AA.SS. June, IV., p. 302 C.

³ See Fére in Stedman's "Twentieth Century Practice," vol. X., pp. 540-541. The gastric spasm which often precedes such an *hæmatemesis* might easily be interpreted as the wound of an invisible lance.

⁴ Paulson, p. 83, l. 24.

great sport, throwing it at Gertrude, the Plebanus's sister, and then "tying it to the neck of our servant, so that pretty well the whole parish was in a flutter of excitement." Then he began to fling stones about, "hitting my dear father on the head and bruising his arm in two places," while Gertrude, the Plebanus's sister, received a terrible blow on the forehead. A Jewess also, who scoffed at these manifestations and defied the spirit, was struck on the head with a very big stone, and another stone was hurled at two of the friars, whom she names, though it passed between them without doing them any injury. But the demon's malicious pranks also took other forms. The Prior of the neighbouring Benedictine abbey of Brauweiler, who was a great friend of Christina's, was bitten in the hand in eleven places. Peter's former colleague, Father John Muffendorf, was badly hurt in a similar way, and so was the Plebanus. "I saw the scar," adds Christina, "it was three inches long, just above the wrist"; and she also mentions other victims.

Christina herself, of course, was the principal sufferer, but it is difficult to tell how far the injuries she mentions could be substantiated by outside testimony. Like the rest she herself was bitten and had stones flung at her—five different kinds of stones, she tells Peter, besides bones of animals. She seems, however, to appeal to external testimony when she says that "præsentibus pueris"—does she mean that children were present, or the servants of the household?—the devil on five occasions bound ligatures round her fingers and legs so tightly that the blood flowed. We are also informed that he crushed her toes in such an iron grip that the blood spurted from the nails. But, as in the case of Mollie and Dobby Giles, the tormentor seems to have taken special delight in biting her in the back, "inflicting innumerable wounds" and making the two rows of teeth meet beneath the skin.¹ The blood ran to the ground in such streams that "those who looked on could not restrain their tears." She also declares that the demon stuffed into her mouth the flesh and head of a skinned cat and that there were onlookers who saw the cat's bleeding head protruding from between her lips. Further, that in the presence of some of the Friars he burnt her fur cape and her blouse (tunica) while she was actually wearing them, and filled her mouth with invisible sulphur so that she could taste noth-

¹ The reading "infra guttur" of the "Acta Sanctorum" has been corrected by Paulson (p. 86, l. 11) from the Jülich MS. to "infra cutem."

ing else. She also complains that for a whole night she seemed to see him breathing flame into her face and baring horrible teeth in readiness to devour her, while a noise was heard as of the lowing of oxen and the bleating of sheep.

For some at least of the incidents here recounted, extravagant as the account must seem, independent corroboration is forthcoming. Father Maurice, O.P., one of the community at Cologne, writing to Peter about the same time, makes brief but clear reference to the incident of the skull, the biting, the burning of her garments and the stone-throwing. He tells him that Christina's father and mother and all her friends, including the Dominicans who knew her, were very solicitous about the terrible molestations to which the devil subjected her:—

He gnaws her flesh like a dog [Maurice declares], and bites out great pieces; he burns her clothes next her skin while she is wearing them, and shows himself to her in horrible forms. The fiend is not satisfied with disfiguring her person, but he has brought in the head of a dead man, using this skull to appear before her bodily eyes and speaking to her through it. Moreover, he exhibits himself to other people under the guise of this bald and bare cranium. He has hurt and wounded some of our own community. Likewise the Prior of Brauweiler has suffered many contusions, and in particular a Jew and his wife who wanted to drive him away have been so pelted and routed that they will no longer come near the place. There are many other performances of his I could tell you of, but it would be a long story.⁴

So far as regards the skull we have in Letter vii. an interpolation, apparently inserted by Peter himself, to this effect: "The Plebanus told me that the demon sometimes placed the skull upon the ground but sometimes lifted it up higher than the grating of the house, just as it pleased him."⁵ It is quite intelligible that a skull moving about in the air by itself should have caused a considerable sensation, and we may easily conceive how Father Maurice and others formed the idea that the devil was *in* the skull. It should also be noticed that Peter seems to have learnt in conversation with Father Gerard and another friar that they had been present conversing with Christina when her tormentor tore off both the sleeves of her

⁴ AA.SS. June, vol. IV., p. 306 A.

⁵ Paulson, p. 85, ll. 8-9.

tunic, then its sides, and finally a great portion of her fur cape.¹

Further poltergeist phenomena, which seem altogether to pass the limits of credibility, are stated to have occurred during the winter and spring which followed Peter's departure for Sweden. They are recorded by the Plebanus, who endorses Christina's narrative. If they happened at all, they must have been known to the whole country side, and it seems clear that Peter, when at a later date he once more visited Stommeln, believed that he had obtained confirmation of the facts from those he questioned. It must suffice very briefly to note that the demon dragged Christina out of her bed by the hair of her head on to the "testudo" (the gable?) of her room, wielding a sword with which he wounded her sister, Hilla, in the back and slashed her dress. Thus Christina, we are told, lay crushed against the roof while spectators looked on and the sword was being brandished in the air above her head without any hand being seen.² Her father—it was in her own home that this had taken place—ran for the Plebanus, and he coming in all haste heard the clash of the sword as soon as he entered the yard. They brought a ladder, and the Plebanus tried to climb up, but the devil struck him several times on the head with the blade. It must presumably have been with the flat of the weapon, for the good priest seems to have sustained no serious injury. A lance was brought to parry the blows, the devil decamped and the poor sufferer was rescued. A little later one of the friars was violently thrown out of the room in which he was sitting, and others were cut and wounded. The dresses and household-linen of the Plebanus's mother, which it seems were kept in a chest in the church, were also destroyed by the fiend, and he afterwards removed and cut to pieces Christina's shoes while she was kneeling in the church at Brauweiler, tearing off at the same time half the skin of her feet. The most extraordinary incident, however, at this period was the following. A week before Christmas the devil one night pierced her feet with two willow twigs and dragged her out of her window through the garden and over the hedge, suspending her eventually upon a tree to the trunk of which he tied her by her hands and feet. There she remained for an hour before her absence was discovered. The Plebanus, who tells us this, states that he was sent for and that

¹ Paulson, p. 121.

² *Ibid.*, p. 135, l. 7, "cum autem intraret vidit gladium vibrari sine manibus
uper testudinem."

he himself untied her in the presence of her distracted mother. At midday three days later a similar thing happened. She was found, clothed in nothing but her shift and bound to another tree. The Plebanus declares in his own name that one of the monks of Brauweiler helped him to release her and that quite a number of people were looking on. The willow twigs seem in this case to have been twisted into something like traces and to have been passed under the skin through her back and neck. Father John Muffendorf professed to have seen them and at a later date corroborated orally the story which had been told to Peter in a letter by the Plebanus.¹

I am very much at a loss to know what to think of all this. It seems incredible that Peter whose honesty and piety stand revealed to us in his correspondence can deliberately have invented such a tale or have forged the letters which recounted it. He had seen the stigmata with his own eyes and he knew that they were every year renewed. He and his fellow religious had been present when Christina had repeatedly been deluged with filth, and they had witnessed what they believed to be other preternatural manifestations of diabolic power. There was probably no limit to the credulity which they were prepared to extend to all that was told them, and there would have been a powerful but unconscious tendency to exaggerate and decorate any little marvellous incident which occurred. But either Christina was twice over dragged out of her bed, carried across the garden and bound to a tree outside, or she was not. Peter averred that the very tree was pointed out to him at a later visit. The Plebanus, who was her confessor and whom she trusted and venerated, himself wrote the letters filled with circumstantial detail, and had himself on both occasions released her. These things had happened in broad daylight. This was not a case in which we have merely the report of what Christina believed she had experienced when alone. The circumstances were witnessed and attested not only by the little group of her own family circle and her devoted associates, but also by Benedictine monks of Brauweiler and by Dominicans of Cologne. The idea of an elaborate hoax at Peter's expense maintained for years in documents that fill scores of printed folio pages, cannot, it seems to me, be entertained for a moment. Apart from the undoubted veneration with which Christina was surrounded and the character of those concerned, writing materials in the thirteenth

¹ See AA.SS. June, vol. IV., pp. 319-320.

century were far too precious to permit of fooling on so elaborate a scale.

Nothing of grave moment, apart from family bereavements, pecuniary losses and spiritual trials, seems to have befallen Christina between the events last recorded, which belong to the year 1271, and the death of John Plebanus in June, 1277. At any rate no details have been preserved to us. In 1279 Peter once again paid a brief visit to Stommeln, but seems to have found his friend notably more distant and reserved than she had shown herself ten years earlier. From this time forward Magister Johannes, the young schoolmaster who aspired to the priesthood, becomes her amanuensis. Peter met him on this visit in 1279 and seems to have considered him a devout and trustworthy man. Somehow one gets the impression that he had in a measure supplanted Peter in Christina's regard. Her expressions of affection in writing to the Dominican become much more restrained. Her main interest seems to centre in the requests she makes that Peter would use his influence to help one of her brothers and Johannes himself. On the other hand she says of the last named, who then believed that he might be compelled to leave Stommeln on account of the dearth of pupils, "if he (Johannes) should go away, I must tell you, dear friend, that my heart will experience a deeper sorrow than I have ever felt for the death of anyone I have known."¹

Be this as it may, the accounts of Christina's experiences between 1279 and 1287 which reached her Dominican friend through the intermediary of Magister Johannes are so preposterous that, if they really emanated from herself, one can only regard them as the hallucinations of a brain which, for the time being at least, was completely unhinged. Let us take a minor point first—the obsession that whole armies of demons were concentrated in the assault upon her, a pious but neurotic béguine, who lived and died in obscurity and who, so far as we can see, never influenced more than a handful of her contemporaries. In Holy Week, 1280, she is represented as announcing that 91 devils took part in the attack upon her and were all vanquished.² A little later, 100 assisted in the tortures inflicted upon her person;³ but after another short interval, the number, we are told, amounted to 1,000.⁴ In a

¹ AA.SS. June, vol. IV., p. 340 B.

² *Ibid.*, p. 324 C.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 341 A.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 341 D.

great crisis just before Pentecost, 1281, 10,000 were brought up to make a final and desperate assault, but failing, they handsomely confessed their defeat in these precise terms :—

Behold us here, a band of demons, ten thousand in number, who have been chosen from all our lodges as more wicked than the rest, and have been constrained by the will of the Almighty to tempt thee by every evil wile and to inflict the most cruel torments ; but lo ! thou art proof against assault, O Christina, handmaid of God, thou art unconquerable ; for the virtue of the Most High that abideth in thee cannot be overcome, and it does not allow thee to be deceived or to be discomfited. Have pity on us, then, and allow us to go free, for thy prayers torment us and consume us as with flame.¹

Still the climax was only reached on Christmas Eve, 1283, when 40,050 devils were engaged in conflict with the spouse of Christ, were routed and again confessed defeat. Father Papebroch, in a very curious note upon this passage, admits that 40,050 devils is a large number, but it does not seem to suggest to him any misgivings as to the trustworthiness of the narrative and he is content to remind the reader that the evil spirit in Luke viii., 30, proclaimed that his name was legion. In the same note Father Papebroch, making reference to the dread often expressed by demons when exorcised that they will be forced to quit their human shelter, conjectures that many of these beings since the time of the Fall have been wandering about the world and intervening in human affairs as "aeriæ potestates" (powers of the air), not having yet been relegated to their final doom. They are, however, grievously afraid of being cast out from the earth into hell, which means for them the ultimate prison house from which they cannot again escape to do mischief.²

However, Christina's numerical computation of the hosts of ghostly enemies that had assailed her are a small matter besides the incredible details which the letters of Johannes contain regarding her trials. No one who has not waded through the long folio pages in the "Acta Sanctorum" can form any idea of the wearisome reiterations and extravagances set down in this accumulation of horrors. Over and over again we have what is fundamentally the same descrip-

¹ AA.SS. June, vol. IV., p. 357 C.

² *Ibid.*, p. 385 EF. In quoting the "Acta Sanctorum" I have throughout these articles used the original edition. This particular volume appeared in 1707.

tion of a type of hideous nightmare, except that it is put before us as something which actually occurred. Troops of devils come in revolting shapes. They seize upon Christina in her room at night, drag her from her bed, carry her away naked or half-clad to some lonely spot amid snow and ice and mud. There they proceed to chop her to pieces or tear her limb from limb. It is Christina herself, or her amanuensis, who in one place compares the process to the work of a butcher cutting up joints of pork. They tear apart or sever her wrists, her ankles, her elbows, her knees and then her neck and head until finally she expires. But before the final stage is reached an opportunity is found to vary the general programme by incidents which reproduce the crudest imaginings of the artists of old who depicted the torments of hell. The devils show themselves as toads and snakes and wolves and cats and bears and wild horses, and we hear of "a horrible demon with a head like a great kettle, and horns all round and a number of eyes between the horns." There are tridents, and ladles and scourges and cauldrons of sulphur and pitch. Long strips of flesh are torn from her body, lumps (*frusta*) with the hair attached are wrenched out of her head, they beat her with hammers, pour burning sulphur down her throat, scorch her face with lightning, scourge her with leaded whips, toss her into a blazing fire, pound her with pestles in a mortar, tie her to a putrid corpse, cast her into a well, and throw her down from the roof of a church.

If this had happened only on a single occasion, the description would, even so, be a trial to the reader's credulity and patience, but it is represented as the drama re-enacted with variations every night for a score of nights in succession ;⁴ and always the end is the same. Two angels come to her rescue, or even Jesus Christ Himself, or His holy Mother. The devils are put to flight, the fragments of the mangled corpse are reassembled, she is miraculously restored to life and conveyed back to her bed, where she awakens next morning in her normal health and without any marks of injury. There is, of course, in this part of the story no trace of corroboration from outside sources. Nobody pretends to have entered her room at night and found her bed untenanted. Nobody is

⁴ I cannot help being reminded of the reiterations which one encounters in the visions of such mystics as, say, Teresa Higginson or Domenica dal Paradiso. The spiritual espousal by which a highly privileged soul is united to Jesus Christ, the Bridegroom, as the climax of some period of trial, is quite intelligible. But why should this betrothal scene be reenacted again and again, and almost invariably, as it seems to me, as if it had never occurred before?

known to have heard the cries of the demons as they carried her off, or to have come upon traces of the fires they kindled, or of the scourges, the mallets, the tridents, the iron hooks and the other paraphernalia described. It is true that at Christmas, 1281, Christina was found by some workmen in the early morning almost completely submerged in a morass and apparently insensible—this we learn from the letter of one of the Cologne Dominicans to Father Peter, and there was another occasion when, during the hard frost of a winter's night, groans were heard coming from the yard of a neighbouring house. The owner went out and discovered Christina wedged in among some timber and absolutely devoid of clothing (*omnino nuda*). It was, of course, taken for granted that in both instances the devil had forcibly carried her off. But there is such a thing as somnambulism, and all nerve specialists have much to tell us about "fugues," which are often attended by a temporary loss of memory. Moreover, what, on these occasions, were the angels doing, who so habitually came to her rescue when she reached the last extremity?

How did the extravagances recounted above come to be written? Father Papebroch was apparently persuaded that these things really happened. For my own part I should find it easier to believe that the whole story was a romance concocted, letters and all, by Peter of Dacia and that no such person as Christina ever existed. Still, it is surely possible to find less violent solutions. In the letters written by Magister Johannes to Peter I have noticed two very curious and significant statements. The first occurs in a communication belonging to the close of 1280. Johannes says: "I should not be able to tell you anything of the sufferings of your (spiritual) child, if it were not that fortunately her rapture after Communion, rather than any conscious disclosure of her experiences, has revealed to me what I ought to write to you."¹ I infer from this that in her usual ecstasy after Communion Christina either spontaneously spoke aloud, like people who talk in their sleep, or, as is often the case in the hypnotic trance, could be induced to answer questions and make statements of which she afterwards probably remembered nothing.

¹ I have translated rather freely. I should be able to tell you nothing, he says "si non magis filiae vestre post Communionem felix alienatio, quam ipsius conscientie relatio, mihi ea quæ scribere vobis debedo ostendisset." AA.SS. June, IV., p. 340 E. Paulson, p. 198, ll. 21-24, who points out that *conscientie* is a more correct reading than *conscientia*.

The second passage, pointing to the same conclusion, belongs to a letter rather earlier in date. In this Johannes writes : " These secrets (regarding Christina) I make known to your Reverence, though they were communicated to me not from any human source but by God's ordering (divinitus). I tell you this that you may understand that Christina, your child, when in full possession of her faculties (*sui compos*) related nothing of what is written above concerning her sufferings except a very few things. And she would not have spoken at all unless she had heard me question her as if I already knew all about it."¹

I am strongly inclined to think, then, that all the extravagances which so much repel the reader in the later record of Christina's ordeal were not communicated by her when she was *sui compos*. Without accusing Johannes of deliberate invention, I conjecture that the visionary in her trances talked a good deal, or was led on to talk by his questions, and that he, almost of necessity, had to fill in the gaps in her tale of horrors with a good deal of guesswork.

On the other hand it would seem that she was undoubtedly, as such hysterical subjects often are, an unconscious medium. The poltergeist phenomena which occurred around her, she very naturally attributed according to the ideas of all her contemporaries to diabolic persecution. The result was that her subliminal consciousness was continually obsessed by the fear of some fiendish antagonist, or rather of a multitude of such antagonists. Moreover we may be quite sure that in such an atmosphere as that in which she lived any strange phenomena which did occur would not lose in the telling. Let it be remembered that the hysterical neurosis from which she undoubtedly suffered and which is made manifest in her account of her experiences in early life, does not in the least conflict with the supposition that she was truly and deeply devout. But the existence of heroic sanctity, as Benedict XIV. has clearly laid down, is not guaranteed by stigmata, levitations and other charismata however remarkable, but only by a consistently virtuous conduct in the trials of daily life and by an adequate use of the opportunities which may present themselves of promoting the service and glory of God.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 334 F. Paulson, p. 181, ll. 21-25.

EARLY ACCOUNTS OF JOHN OGILVIE, S.J.

JOHN OGILVIE, a Scottish Jesuit was hanged at Glasgow Cross on March 10, 1615. According to the indictment read at his trial he had "committed most hainous, detestable, and unpardonable treason." Of late years there have appeared several ¹ short lives of him by authors who are convinced that he died merely because he professed doctrines which every Catholic priest in his position was bound to affirm.

In such historical questions there are really two points to be investigated. The first is to establish the sequence of events. As in all historical investigations this must be done from contemporary documents. The defenders of John Ogilvie's memory have used the *Relatio Incarcerationis* written by himself and continued by his fellow-prisoners, the *True Relation* written under the direction of Spottiswoode, his judge, and the evidence given at a preliminary process of beatification begun at Würzburg and Rome in the years 1628 and 1629. Their conclusions on this point have not been seriously controverted by any competent historian of the last hundred years. The second point to be established is the first interpretation of the events. We are nowadays so far removed from the seventeenth century, and it is so difficult to refashion the atmosphere of the time, that, even with all the facts before us, our judgment of them may be wrong. It is not easy at first to see how this can be avoided. How can we control and correct the impression which contemporary documents create? They will not blush when they lie and yet a document, even a legal document, can give a false impression. But the men of the seventeenth century who had known Ogilvie, and the men who put him to death who knew the circumstances of the time and all the current gossip, were in a much better position. They were not at the mercy of a written document but were able to know whether the facts as set out, actual facts as we know them to be, did mean that the man had died for the defence of the Church or not. In order,

¹ C. J. Karslake, "An Authentic Account" (1877). James Forbes, "Martyre de Jean Ogilvie" (1885, 2nd Ed. 1901). D. Conway, "John Ogilvie, Jesuit" (1915). Forbes and Cahill, "A Scottish Knight-errant" (1920). W. E. Brown, "John Ogilvie" (1925).

then, to check our documents we ought to investigate how the accounts given by those documents were received by the men who knew Ogilvie and knew the mind of society which put him to death. If there was a widespread belief amongst contemporaries that he died for the Catholic Church, then we can accept the statements of his personal friends; if his friends did not obtain public credence in an age when men could test their statements, then it would be difficult to accept their judgment to-day, when such opportunity is lacking.

Since the recent biographers have not discussed this second point, I propose in this article to examine the accounts of the execution of John Ogilvie (other than the main sources mentioned already) which were published within the half century succeeding that event. The first writer to be considered is a Jesuit, James Gaultier. In 1616 he published at Paris a work entitled *Tabula Chronographica status ecclesiæ Catholicæ a Christo nato usque ad annum MDCXIV*.¹ In it he gave chronological and parallel lists of the popes, antipopes, emperors, patriarchs, ecclesiastical writers, saints and illustrious men, with the chief incidents of their lives, reigns, and pontificates. The intention of the author was to bring his tables down to the year 1614 inclusive, but a delay in publication enabled him to insert also a few events of 1615. Among the events of that year which he remembered was the execution of John Ogilvie and he records it thus on p. 818:—

P. Ogilbaeus Scotus Societatis Jesu pro Christi Fide et Ecclesiæ Catholicæ autoritate trucidatus 1615.

The interest of this notice is that it was almost certainly written before the *Relatio Incarcerationis* was published. Not only is this probable because of the date of Gaultier's work (1616), but also because he does not refer to the *Relatio* nor make use of any of its phrases to describe the event; and in this he differs from all the later accounts. From Gaultier then we may safely deduce that there was at any rate one centre—amongst the Jesuits of Northern France—where the belief that Ogilvie had died a martyr was prevalent independently of the claim later published in the *Relatio* and its continuation.

The various editions of the last named work form the second group to which attention should be directed. There are ex-

¹ The only copy I know of is in the library of the Gregorian University at Rome. Unless otherwise noted, all the books mentioned in this article are in the British Museum.

amples of three in the British Museum, and there is a fourth kept in the library of the Jesuit Fathers in London. The earliest is that printed at Douai in 1615 by the widow of Laurence Kellarn and its title page assures the world that it was printed "ex autographo ipsius martyris." The second was printed at Mainz in 1616 but, as the title page reminds us, the work had previously been printed at Douai. It was not, however, a mere copy of the earlier edition for some sections of the *Relatio* are rightly described as letters of Ogilvie, while in the Douai edition they had already been made part of the text. There is also a preface in this Mainz edition by one who claimed an intimate knowledge of Ogilvie, but of this anon. The Ingoldstadt version, printed by the widow Elizabeth Anjer, does not mention the Douai edition but is clearly a mere copy, for it reproduces the approbation of its censor. The same is true of the Würzburg edition, printed in 1616 by Conrad Schwindthauff.

At the beginning of the Mainz edition of the *Relatio* there is an "advertisement" given to the reader on the authority of a Father Gisbertus Schenichavus (Gilbert Schenck), a theologian who was for many years Ogilvie's superior. It is for the most part a panegyric, praising the young man's talents and character, dwelling on his wit, his cheerful disposition, his "incredible zeal for the salvation of souls." We need not perhaps give a literal interpretation to the superlatives, but the good father adds a few facts about Ogilvie which are important. He mentions that Ogilvie did his philosophical studies at Gratz. Further that he was prepared for the priesthood by Father Claude Aquaviva, and that, after receiving the order to proceed to Scotland, he passed through Mainz and stayed at the college a night. There he made his confession, celebrated Mass in the morning, and refusing further hospitality went on his way. It is an event which has not been noticed by the French and English biographers, and may cause us to revise the hitherto accepted statements as to his itinerary to Scotland. But the chief reason for drawing attention to this "advertisement" is that it shows that men who knew Ogilvie intimately were prepared to accept the account of his martyrdom given in the *Relatio* and its continuation, and found in it nothing at variance with what they already knew of his character.

The title page of the Ingoldstadt edition shows it to have been intended as a book of spiritual reading for young men. It runs thus:—

"Minoris congregationis academicæ beatissimæ virginis annunciatæ sodalibus ab illustri et generoso D. Carolo Emanuele Madrutio, eiusdem congregationis Præfecto, strenæ loco oblata."

Even a year after Ogilvie's death, then, and in lands where his life as a Jesuit had been spent, and where there were many who had known him intimately, there was sufficient devotion to him, sufficient belief in his martyr-character to make it possible for an account of his sufferings and death to be offered to a society of pious laymen as suitable reading for their spiritual edification.

The evidence so far considered shows that where Ogilvie had been known, at Mainz and Ingoldstadt, there was within a year of his death a real though local devotion to him and a belief that he died a martyr. At first confined to the Jesuits and their Sodalists, it very soon took a wider range, as we see by considering the accounts of Ogilvie published in the following twenty years, *i.e.*, in a period when first-hand knowledge of him was still easily obtainable. Of this group the earliest is Thomas Dempster, who published at least three works on Scottish ecclesiastical history *sc.*—the *Apparatus ad historiam Scoticam* of 1622, the *Menelogium Scotorum* of the same year, the *Historia Ecclesiastica gentis Scotorum sive de scriptoribus Scotis* of 1627. Dempster was a friend of James VI. and professed a keen appreciation of that monarch's political theories. It might therefore be supposed that he would have had little sympathy with Ogilvie, who had so fiercely condemned the Oath of Allegiance which James invented for Catholics. Yet in each of these books Dempster mentions Ogilvie as having died because "he manfully upheld the primacy of Peter and the dignity of the Apostolic See." The most important addition which Dempster makes to our knowledge is in a footnote to the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. He says: "Scripsit epistolas ad varios, lib I, acta martyrii sui lib. I., quæ Duaci prodierunt, et autographum in Sacrario Societatis Jesu religiose asservatur Romæ."¹ In addition he gives the information, contained in none of the printed editions of the *Relatio*, that Ogilvie had joined the Society at Brünn.

Another of this group is Pierre d'Oultreman, S.J., who in 1623 drew up *Tableaux des Personnages signalés de la Compagnie de Jésus*. It was written (as the title goes on to inform

¹ "Dempster, Historia Eccl." 2nd. Ed., II. p. 510.

us) for the celebrations at the Jesuit College at Douay of the canonization of St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Francis Xavier. The account of Ogilvie is taken for the most part from the *Relatio*, but d'Oultreman had other sources of information as well for he adds (what is not contained in any edition of the *Relatio*) that Ogilvie was educated at the Scots College in the Low Countries, and that he entered the Society in 1597. The only other point of new interest is his explanatory comment on one of Ogilvie's answers to his persecutors:—"Comme il estoit facetieux." Since d'Oultreman was moving amongst people who had known Ogilvie personally, this does add slightly to our knowledge of the man. A third author is David Chambers (Camerarius). He was a Scottish secular priest settled in France and said to be in receipt of a papal pension.¹ While in Paris he wrote a book, *De Scotorum fortitudine Doctrina et Pietate ac de ortu et progressu haeresis in Regnis Scotiae et Angliae*. It was published according to the title page at the expense of Peter Baillet but, according to a manuscript note on the fly-leaf of the British Museum copy, P. Morin had it printed in 1631. The author was acquainted with the existence of the *Relatio* for he mentions that an account of the martyrdom exists which was printed at Douai. In his own short notice, however, he does not borrow the words of the *Relatio*, but says that Ogilvie suffered "quod strenue Pontificis dignitatem ac Catholicæ fidei puritatem tueretur."

Six years before Chambers wrote his book, a priest of the order of Minims of St. Francis of Paul, Hilarion de Coste, had published his *Histoire Catholique* at Paris. It was, as the title said, a description of men and women whose piety and sanctity had made them notable in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Ogilvie appears as "Jean Gilbeus" and it is said that he suffered on May 10th, 1615. The notice is interesting only because it mentions that an account had already been given by Richeome and Ribadeneira in their Catalogues and by Gaultier and Gordon in their chronology. The latter reference has already been noted in this article; the former shows that our list of early mentions of Ogilvie is by no means exhaustive. Indeed de Coste goes on to mention "other authors, such as Benzonius, Bishop of Lorette, who speak of Campion and Ogilvie in honourable terms in their

¹ "Archiv. de Prop. Fide, Causae. 312f. 43." He was not the well-known judge of the Court of Session of the same name, despite the B.M. catalogue.

works." But the interest of this group as we have implied does not lie in their number nor in their references; it lies rather in the fact that devotion to Ogilvie had, in the twenty years after his execution, spread beyond the Jesuit centres, and that in spite of a certain unfriendliness between "seculars and regulars." We can say, then, that belief in Ogilvie's martyrdom had by the year 1631 spread amongst all the Scottish exiles for religion, *i.e.*, amongst men who had every reason to know the true facts, and de Coste is evidence that the devotion was even more widely accepted.

A word must be said of the tradition amongst the Protestant writers who were enemies of Ogilvie's religion, in order to see how far they contradict the Catholic version of the story. The *True Relation of the Proceedings against John Ogilvie*, printed at Edinburgh in 1615, under the direction of the Protestant Archbishop Spottiswoode, has been reproduced in at least two of the recent biographies. I have pointed out elsewhere that, whilst it does not really contradict the statements of the *Relatio*, it gives them a different and an adverse interpretation. It records, for example, concerning the execution :

Ogilvie ending his prayer, arose to go up the ladder but strength and courage, to the admiration of those who had seen him before, did quite forsake him : he trembled, and shaked, saying he would fall, and could hardly be helped up on the top of the ladder.

The facts here recorded are simple; Ogilvie found great difficulty in mounting the ladder and shook in doing so; he had to be helped up. The Protestant unwarrantably puts this down to fear, whereas, as we read in the *Relatio*, it was due to the fact that—"Then they tied his hands again behind his back, and so tightly that his fingers trembled." The last phrase is almost a guarantee of veracity, for it is the first thing that an onlooker would notice, the last that a romancer would invent.

This prejudiced interpretation is, I think, generally noticeable in the *True Relation*. There does not appear to be a single invention as to fact in the whole account and very little suppression of truth. But in each case the author has endeavoured so to interpret the facts as to make Ogilvie appear in a bad light. And he omits to mention, what the continuation of the *Relatio* explicitly states, viz., that even the Protestants held Ogilvie innocent of any treasonable offence,

and the authorities guilty of murder. We can gather his opinion, however, from the ancient title page of the *True Relation*, which is decorated with appropriate texts, intended to indicate that the martyr was a contumacious rebel.

Just as the *True Relation* confirms the *Relatio* so Calderwood's *True History of the Church of Scotland* confirms the statements made by an Italian pamphlet published in Rome in the year of Ogilvie's execution. Elsewhere,¹ I have tried to show the extent to which that pamphlet is reliable, I had not then noticed that its account of Fr. Moffet's arrest is substantially the same as that given in Calderwood. The pamphlet was written from gossip and says so in its title (at least, it refers merely to letters received from Scotland, which amounts to the same thing), but that gossip must have been fairly accurate, for Calderwood, who had every reason to know the facts, gives the same version of the one incident of the pamphlet which he has occasion to mention.

Though the Protestant accounts do in these ways confirm the Catholic traditions, there remains the fact that Spottiswoode endeavoured, both at the trial and in the account of it which he caused to be published, to suggest that Ogilvie suffered because he upheld regicide doctrines. It is clear, even from the evidence of the prosecution, that this was not the case; not only did Ogilvie refuse to give an answer to the "bloody question," but the indictment of which he was found guilty had to mention the Statutes under which he was condemned, and these were concerned with maintaining the King's spiritual jurisdiction which Ogilvie repudiated. But Spottiswoode wanted to be able to say that Ogilvie was not put to death for being a Catholic, and so he insisted on bringing in the question of regicide, though this was not legally the cause at issue. It is interesting to notice that when the whole affair was a matter of past history, Spottiswoode himself was ready to let the truth be known. He wrote his *History of Church and State of Scotland* in the thirties of the seventeenth century, and in it he quoted freely from documents he had received during his period of office. He describes the affair of Ogilvie and gives the King's instructions:

If nothing could be found but that he was a Jesuit and had said Mass, they should banish him the country, and inhibit him to return without licence, under pain of death.

¹ Brown "John Ogilvie," p. 228 ff.

But if it should appear that he had been a practiser for the stirring up of subjects to rebellion or did maintain the Pope's transcendent power over kings, and refused to take the oath of allegiance, they should leave him to the course of Law and Justice.

The course of law and justice in Britain of the early seventeenth century meant death for the man who persistently affirmed the spiritual authority of the Pope over Christians. Spottiswoode endeavoured to show that Ogilvie was engaged in stirring up a rebellion but, as his own account showed, the effort was unsuccessful. There remains the other capital offence of King James' letter; Ogilvie upheld the Pope's "transcendent power over kings and refused to take the oath of allegiance." For this cause, not only judicially but in the King's intention, he was put to death, and it is not so very different from the statement of the Catholic author's "quod strenue Pontificis dignitatem ac Catholicæ fidei puritatem tueretur."

About a quarter of a century after a man's death personal memory of him becomes rare, and it is not surprising to find that from 1640 ecclesiastical writers relate of Ogilvie only what they could find in already printed accounts. This is true of Juan Nieremberg's *Firmamento Religioso* published in 1644. It is true also of Alegambe's *Mortes illustres*¹ which he completed in 1655 and which Fr. Nadasi added to and published at Rome two years later. The chief interest of these writers is that they refer to others who had previously written of Ogilvie. Nieremberg mentions the Synopsis of James Damian.² Alegambe adds the following to our bibliography: George Stengel *de vi exemplorum*, Elias a St. Teresia *in legatione ecclesiæ triumphantis*. I have not been able to find copies of these books.

I must mention Balbinus' *Miscellanea historica regni Bohemiae Decadis I seu Bohemiae Sancta*, published at Prague in 1682 and giving a full account of the martyr, although it falls outside the fifty years which I have taken as the scope of my inquiry. Balbinus relates that, at the execution, Ogilvie flung his rosary to the crowd, and that it struck a Bohemian, Jean de Eckersdorff, who attributed his subsequent conver-

¹ There is no copy of this work of Alegambe's in the British Museum. I have used a copy in the library of the Gregorian University at Rome.

² Possibly the work which was translated into French in 1642 as "Tableau racourci de ce qui s'est fait par la Compagnie de Jesus durant son premier siècle." The letter contains a short account of Ogilvie Lib. VI. c. II.

sion to this event. Recent biographers have usually repeated this story. The story has been accepted with reserve because Balbinus says expressly that he is relating the event more than twenty years after he heard it from Eckersdorff. But we have good reason to trust his recollection. Amongst the collection of papers at Blairs College, there is a statement,¹ drawn up and signed by Balbinus in 1671,² to the effect that he had heard the story from Eckersdorff in 1658, thus confirming the "more than twenty years ago" of the *Bohemia Sancta* of 1682. Moreover, the phrases of the document are not repeated in the later work and yet in substance the two narratives are the same. This document, showing the accuracy of Balbinus' memory, suggests a fact which has hitherto been unnoticed. It is dated 10th February, 1671. There exists also in the Blairs collection a statement by Fr. James Brown of what his father had told him of Ogilvie's execution in 1638. This statement is dated 23rd February, 1672. To it is added another by Fr. Thomas Rob of the account given in 1633 by Lady Margaret Hamilton about the supposed appearance of Ogilvie at Glasgow Cross on the night before his execution. This is not the place to discuss the value of the testimonies but it is worth remark that all three are in legal form and are dated practically within twelve months of one another. There could be only one purpose for such statements. In this year as in 1628 those who knew about Ogilvie must have been collecting scraps of evidence with a view to his beatification. Now that efforts are again being made in that direction it is pleasant to remember that it is no case of creating a character merely from written documents, but that we are dealing with a man who so impressed his contemporaries that twice in the sixty years which followed his death they made an effort to have him officially declared a martyr.

W. E. BROWN.

¹ I owe my acquaintance of it to His Lordship the Bishop of Aberdeen, who discovered it there and kindly sent me a transcript.

² "Hæc audisse me sacerdotale fide testor."

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

THE WORSHIP OF THE FOG.

EVERY now and then, when a crisis calls for intervention, *The Saturday Review* invites its Anglican contributor to give guidance to a distracted Church, and then, out of the mist, issues a voice of which all that can be truthfully said is that it deepens and darkens the medium which involves it. The voice was invoked from time to time during the prolonged Prayer-Book crisis. In the issue for November 24, 1923, it said, *inter alia* :—" That divergent views [about the Eucharist], not necessarily contradictory, are held by different groups of English Churchmen is, and always has been a fact, though not a patent fact." Here are two mistakements: the view that Christ is objectively present in the Eucharist is necessarily contradictory to the view that Christ is objectively absent; moreover, the fact of these opposed views being held by Anglicans has always been patent. Later on the writer grants that:—" It is a painful confession of weakness, and, not the less painful for being an admission of fact, that the Anglican Church should speak with two or more voices," but instead of further confessing that therefore the Anglican Church is not the Church of Christ, he insinuates that all " Churches " are alike in this, but that the others conceal the fact by repeating the same formulas whilst interpreting them differently. " They may speak with one voice but they think with many minds"—a statement, which in one sense is a truism, but, as the writer means it to be taken, is demonstrably false of the Catholic Church, where the unity of faith is secured by active and infallible teaching authority.

That is the last thing your true Protestant really desires. The " two or more voices " in his Church find more than one echo in his " free-thinking " mind. He doesn't want the " fetters on his intellect," which certainty on points of revelation would impose, or, if he does, he wants to impose them himself, so that, if necessary or convenient, he can take them off again. He doesn't want a clear view of the City-set-upon-the-Hill, for then he might feel compelled to enter her gates and abide there. He shrinks from having one straight road set before him, because it might possibly lead to Rome. And so, three years later, writing on the same subject—Prayer-Book Revision (*Saturday Review*, Dec. 4, 1926)—the same oracle pleads for the maintenance of the fog. Admitting that the " authoritative formulæ " of Anglicanism "have been read in differing senses by Anglican schools of thought for centuries," he proceeds :—

We go further, as would, we believe, most scholars and

Church historians, and would say that these formulae were deliberately and intentionally so expressed as to be capable of more than one interpretation.

Were the compilers then dishonest in their work? Oh no, says our casuist, this was

simply a recognition of the fact that these differing views were to be found in the Church of England and were entitled to their place within it. Any formulae which would have excluded any of these views would not truly represent the Anglican position. The essence of that position, almost its reason of being, is intellectual and critical freedom. No other religious communion has such comprehension.

Certainly, no other religious communion makes doubt and uncertainty, instead of faith, its chief *raison-d'être*. The Church thus described is clearly not the Church which Elizabeth found in England on her accession, but rather the Church she founded in the year after. There was no room in the old Church for differences of view in matters of faith. Her position was not variable and vague, but clear and stable, based on rational obedience, not on free thought. A complete breach of continuity is here admitted between the old and the new. However, fearful lest by a too close examination the absurdity of his boasted "comprehension" should become too manifest, the writer on that occasion would let sleeping dogs lie. As he had anticipated, when the whole bother began:

It was almost certain that if the Prayer-Book was to be overhauled, if all the questions which lay beneath its formulae were to be re-opened, every party and every school would try to establish its own views to the exclusion of all others :

a melancholy prophecy all but exactly fulfilled, so little do many Anglicans, for all their complacency in it, understand the spirit of "comprehension." The writer, at any rate would abide contentedly in the fog. He has no longing to quit the pleasant shades of ambiguity and face the fierce glare of truth. To save trouble and confusion he would follow the Bishops "loyally," whilst, of course, retaining his right—one had almost said his birth-right—to differ from them in detail. He must not be told too definitely what to believe and what to do. But alas! people would insist on finding out what Anglicanism really stands for!

Now come his reflections, nearly two years later still (*The Saturday Review*, September 29th,—we are assuming, of course, that the *Saturday*, unlike the English Church, speaks with only one voice—) on the Bishops' meeting to decide their course of action in view of the double rejection of the revised Prayer Book. The voice does not know what the decision will be, but it does know what the Bishops should decide. They must not repeat their former mistakes. It was because the Bishops tried to do two

things at once that they failed in 1927 and 1928. They tried "to enrich and liberalize Anglican worship, and to bring it more effectively into touch with the life and thought of the twentieth century." And they tried to get the law of worship defined sufficiently clearly to be made "an instrument for restoring discipline." In the first effort, the whole country was behind them—"the debate that night made very clear the decisive welcome with which the English people [*i.e.*, a chance majority of their representatives, which was a majority only because of Irish, Scotch and Welsh voters:—why is journalism so inaccurate?] will receive any liberalizing tendency in the teaching and worship of the Church." In other words, Anglicans are very ready, according to this oracle, to be told what they needn't believe. They have apparently groaned under the antiquated dogmas of the old Prayer-Book, and they loved the attempts in the revised Books to make many of them optional. But when it came to combining these "liberalizing tendencies" with making laws more definite and fixing limits to freedom, then the defeat of the Measure became inevitable. "This involved the insertion of rubrics about the Reservation of the Sacrament to which many (rightly or wrongly) [far be it from the voice to say which!] took exception and thus decided to vote against the Book." But what could the poor Bishops do? They were commissioned by Parliament to bring the Book up-to-date so that they could administer it. And the writer himself owns that discipline "is vital to the Church's welfare. . . . To shelve the so-called controversial problems at this stage would not be merely cowardice: it would give the extremists all that they most desire." We need not ask why, on the writer's principles, the extremists should not have all they desire. Why should they be dictated to rather than the others? But inconsistency is the badge of all the Anglican tribe. Private judgment may not be exercised in holding to the past. "The nice adjustment of Catholic and Protestant will do but little to save the soul of England, (!) for neither of these forms of traditionalism can interpret the real needs of the coming time." The Bishops must put first things first. "What matters most is not merely discipline." "What then?" asks the Anglican hierarchy, which would, we are sure, be really grateful to be shown a road out of the *impasse*. Alas! all the help they get is this oracular reply:—

What is needed is a braver emphasis on the real task of the Church of England as a light in the hearts of English men and women, and a far more missionary conception of its opportunity and responsibility.

Back again, after all, into the fog! A whole blanket of it, wrapping up barren abstractions in further obscurity: is it the Church or the task that is to be a light? Anyhow, the Bishops are

to show more courage in emphasizing this task, they are to be "far more missionary" in their ideas of what Anglicanism ought to do. The advice came too late for their meeting : it is conceivable that they did not lament its absence.

But the counsellor has some negative directions to give. Whatever they do, they must not dogmatize, for fog and dogma don't agree. Bishop Gore, in a letter to *The Times*, had suggested that Anglicanism should fix *some* limits to comprehensiveness. Let the Bishops beware of following that pernicious suggestion. "The nation," he says,—again ignoring the fact that only a quarter of the population at most ranks itself Anglican—"the nation is afraid of the Church becoming a sect, highly organized and homogeneous, but allowing itself to be more and more withdrawn from the broad stream of national thought and life." The nation, we submit, is supremely indifferent as to how far Anglicanism ventures to define itself. It is the writer who is afraid, afraid of losing his freedom to doubt, afraid of Anglicanism becoming less attractive to his free-thinking friends, afraid of losing the comfortable haziness which allows him to vary his beliefs with his inclinations. But we note the curious apprehension that a definite knowledge of revealed truth is liable to induce sectarianism. We have that idea in other Anglican utterances.¹ It is one of the devices to which apologists for "comprehensiveness" are often forced. But, applied to divine revelation, which is one consistent and homogeneous whole, it is obviously fallacious. The God who will condemn those who do not accept His revelation must in justice make that revelation clear and certain. Why again should the presentation of a definite and consistent doctrine withdraw a body organized for the purpose "from the broad stream of national thought and life"? The oracle delights in these sonorous but foggy *clichés*, but, assuming that he means by "national life and thought" current ideas about the meaning of life, are not they more likely to be affected by clean-cut and logical teaching than by misty abstractions incapable of definite application?

For the backwardness of Anglicanism the writer blames the Oxford Movement, which "exhumed the 'Notes' of the Church from the theology of the fifth century" and he sets out to save the Bishops from such "academic antiquarianism" and to urge them to put social service before dogma and discipline. He forgets that the Notes of the Church are even more antiquated than the fifth century. They marked the infant institution in the Supper-Room : they stand prominently forth in the Gospels : the Tractarians found them in evidence in their time. It is true that Newman and his Oxford colleagues gave little thought to the social

¹ "A Church which has only one point of view is not a Church, but a sect": Bishop Headlam at the Anglican Church Congress, Oct. 2nd. But surely the Founder of Christianity had only one point of view—the true one—with which He endowed the Church which He instituted.

miseries of their day; they were occupied with what was really more fundamental—the claims of their Church to be the Church of Christ—but the Catholic Church in England, with her sisterhoods of charity and teaching orders, was, as far as grinding poverty and iniquitous laws permitted, solicitous, as was her Founder, for the multitude. In any case, it is only indirectly that the Church is concerned with the removal of social evils. It is by Christianizing the individual that she aims at Christianizing society and thus restoring the influence of moral law to all social relations. She makes men good citizens on earth by qualifying them for citizenship in Heaven. And that cannot be done except by definite moral teaching based on certain intellectual and supernatural truth: a trumpet with "two or more voices" cannot effectively inspire or direct a fight.

Follows yet more cloudy verbiage, for the voice is very anxious that the "Church" should not go wrong, expressing further abstract platitudes and not in the least likely to help the Bishops, except indeed by demonstrating the weird mentalities they have to consult for.

"The nation"—always that unreal abstraction of which the writer has without any warrant constituted himself the spokesman—"is not primarily interested in its [the Church's] difficulties of internal discipline." "Men of good will desire above all things that the Church, by its ministries and worship, should consecrate and bring to true effectiveness the deep but largely inarticulate longings of the people for a new way of life." "The nation is more than ready for an adventurous lead towards religious sincerity and truth, and more experimental forms of worship, which would gather into the Church all that is best in our national life and idealism consecrated by the Christian spirit." "The alternative to Anglo-Catholicism . . . is a more courageous interpretation of the genius of English Christianity, finding new expression in a new world. If the Bishops have the faith and insight to give a strong lead in that direction they will find the people of England close behind them."

The Oracle, we see, is far from dumb as yet, but we fancy the Bishops must have had enough. We can imagine them asking—what is a more courageous interpretation of the genius "of English Christianity"? Why does not our critic say what are "the largely inarticulate longings of the people for a new way of life," or tell us what signs there are that "the nation is more than ready for an adventurous lead," etc., etc.? But they will get no answer, no further inspiration than can be conveyed by these windy and impracticable generalities. And, in any case, what likelihood is there of a notoriously discordant Bench of Bishops influencing the thirty millions or so of non-Anglicans, when they are confessedly

at a loss to guide their own flocks? And what, we may ask, is the state of a Church, claiming to derive from Christ, if at this late date, it has still to be experimenting in worship and seeking for religious sincerity and truth? As far as the fog allows, we gather the upshot of all this counsel to be that Anglicanism, if it is to regain the allegiance of the English, must prove its worth by making itself socially useful. Then people won't mind what it fancies for its creed and liturgy. The Church must concentrate on works and let faith take its chance.

People have only to see for themselves that the Church is seeking the nation's highest good, willing to lose its life that it may find it, for their good-will to be guaranteed. Let the Bishops but make the right gesture while the solution is being found in practice, and nobody will grudge the Church its Prayer-Book.

This, it will be noted, is the Gospel according to Dr. Major who would have the Church put *amo* instead of *credo* into her formulæries. It is a complete negation of revelation in the true sense, and of the need of a Church to safeguard and transmit it. It indicates how deeply the virus of Modernism, or non-supernatural Christianity, has infected Anglicanism, for the voice is not that of one crying in the wilderness but rather that of the fugle-man of a growing multitude. The cult of the fog has gone on so long that any glimmer of definite truth is instinctively resented,—even the elementary dictate of reason, that true knowledge must precede right action. Works without faith are as spiritually dead as faith without works. The poor Bishops are urged to make the right gesture, but forbidden to say why the gesture is right. They are to be guided by sentiment rather than by intellectual truth: perhaps, after all, their mentor is right, for, in a fog, it is by feeling that we make our way.

J. K.

HIGHER RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION:
A Suggested Method.

THE purpose of this paper is confined to stating certain considerations which should be kept in mind by those who are responsible for religious instruction of a secondary or post-primary character in the case of Catholic youth.

In the first place it does not seem to me that there is any very close connection, of cause and effect, between the religious syllabus or curriculum and loyalty to religious practice later on. Probably we should all agree that such a loyalty arises much more out of the will and the heart than out of the operations of the intellect and reason, to use the language of St. Thomas; or if

* The substance of a paper read at the Catholic Head Masters Conference, 1928.

you prefer the useful modern terminology, the faithfulness of individuals to religious practice depends not so much upon their intelligence as upon their love-life. A good syllabus or curriculum is certainly not going to ensure a permanent loyalty. What is true, however, is that a bad curriculum may become a genuine obstacle, hindering a love of the Faith and providing a ready-made excuse for neglecting it later on. By a bad curriculum I mean an unsuitable curriculum—one which is ill-adapted to the mental age and condition of the learners; in short, a curriculum devoid of interest. The chief business of a curriculum-maker is therefore to eliminate from the menu such mental food as is known to be indigestible.

This leads to another consideration, namely, that Syllabus and Method are distinct only *in ratione*, not *in re*. In practice the two things are inseparably connected just as much as diet and cooking. We often draw up a syllabus and then profess to leave methods to the teacher. But here there is fallacy. Method—I mean method of *learning* even more than method of teaching—is the really important thing in school, and syllabus is a comparatively minor point. Consequently, the reasonable procedure is first to make up one's mind which *methods* are best, and then compose a syllabus to fit in with them. Believers in the parrot-system, for instance, would naturally make one sort of syllabus, and a quite different sort would be made by those who see the human mind as something growing and needing the right kind of nourishing food; or by those who think that with older boys religious truth will flourish best in an atmosphere of free-spoken discussion accompanied by competent guidance. So far for preliminaries. Now let us come a little closer to the subject.

It can never be waste of time to study the Gospels, nor will anybody wish to dismiss our Divine Lord's example as irrelevant. How did our Lord teach? What methods did He adopt as being suitable for conveying truth to the human mind?

In that book of Chesterton's with its challenging title, which came like a stirring trumpet-call to us who were young in the years before the war, and weary already both of modernist muddle and anti-modernist panic, G.K.C. remarks that Christ our Lord "had even a literary style of His own." In similar fashion we may say that our Lord had a teaching-method of His own, too. Partly it consists of an extreme readiness to answer questions, because the question shows that the questioner's mind is ready to take in the answer. Also sometimes at an important moment our Lord would ask a question Himself. But in what we may call His ordinary regular ways of teaching we see two main elements. The first is narrative—the story. There are the set parables, which are so numerous; but almost any saying of His, even when not in story-form, carries a picture with it

and a story in germ, as it were; so closely does it keep to the concrete. Also I think it is worthy of note that our Lord's stories are always about *people*.

And the second element is action—parabolic action. No need to enumerate instances—the Gospels are full of them—from everyday incidents such as setting a child in the midst of the Disciples, or making clay for the eyes of the blind man, or the washing of the Disciples' feet, to miracles of symbolic import such as the cursing of the barren figtree, or the feeding of the 5,000. First, He somehow drew attention for the action He was going to do; then He did it; and then He explained it. With our Lord (as afterwards with St. Francis of Assisi) action itself is a language, and if modernists remembered this they would not feel their usual difficulties about such a point as the Ascension. The supreme instance of course is our Lord's death on the Cross; first He prophesied it, then He endured it, and afterwards He "opened the Scriptures" to His disciples in order to explain what He had done on Calvary. Nor is there any need to remind you of how this action-language, this divine school where the deed is more than the word, is epitomized in the Holy Eucharist and perpetuated even to the consummation of the world in the whole liturgical and sacramental system of the Church.

The story charged with human interest, the action charged with significance—these are the two ways of teaching chosen by our Lord; we may fairly argue that He chose them because these are the ways in which ideas really do enter and take root in the human mind; and it will not be rash to try to discover what application of them can be made to our own work.

What is the *Story*, then, that a Catholic education ought to narrate? What else but the story of God becoming man; of our Lord's coming and the preparation for it, of His life and His death, of His founding the Church, and of His care of it ever since?

And what will be the *Action*, the living drama, charged with significance, in which the young Catholic may learn to recognize Truth and Goodness and Beauty at their very Source? What else but the liturgy, or rather the whole devotional life of Catholicism, whether liturgical or extra-liturgical—everything in fact that goes on in church.

In one word, History and Liturgy, Story and Action, might become the twin pillars of an ideal religious training for the ordinary Catholic.

In the primary period of education these ideas could be applied quite simply and literally. Children—I mean children under twelve—ought to learn religion in a child's way: that is by doing the *actions* of religion and having these actions explained to them as occasion arises; and by hearing and reading stories,

especially about our Lord, and about the Saints, too, in preparation for Church history. Also they could learn plenty of things by heart, prayers and hymns and such-like, because such things, made of the language of poetry and life, enter the mind and nourish it even if the meaning is not fully understood at the time; and the children might well be gathering a stock of memorized prayers which would stand them in good stead all their life, say for their thanksgiving after Communion. But the children of primary age should not learn any Catechism by heart, or have anything to do with the Catechism at all. The Catechism and all the definitions and formulas of technical theology should be reserved for secondary school age.¹

And now to apply the foregoing considerations to youths of secondary school age. On the historical side I should ask for an introductory treatment of the history of Israel, and indeed of mankind, up to our Lord's time, in whatever way might be practicable; then a full treatment of the life of our Lord and the founding of the Church, with one of the Gospels for a text; followed by the subsequent history of the Church to our own times, done rapidly like the pre-Christian period, and treated more as a sequel to our Lord's life than as ecclesiastical history studied for its own sake.

If this historical part were done properly, especially as regards our Lord's life, there would be no need for any special treatment of "Apologetics." The present writer thinks that the formal course of standardized Apologetics is unsuitable in a secondary school. It pre-supposes a mass of detailed knowledge and a power of weighing evidence that youths in early 'teens cannot possess.² All they can do with Apologetics is to study up the skeleton arguments that are offered to them, and it is likely enough that the more critical minds may find some of the arguments unsatisfying. It is all too slick, too much "on paper," too diagrammatic. It will all clatter down in pieces in their mind at the first touch of a real difficulty stated with sincerity and vividness. The ordinary boy or girl has no *need* of Apologetics, of course, and as for the clever ones, they need something deeper and more solid than either the Apologetics of the text-books or the platform kind of religious repartee that is found in the Question-Box style of handbook. "The true apologetics," as Canon Driscoll said once, "is the study of history."

On the liturgical side, in secondary schools, I suppose the real thing would be to carry out everything in church as fully

¹ Here I may be allowed to say that the "Sower Scheme of Religious Instruction," in so far as it compromises on this point, still prescribing the Catechism for the primary school, falls short of what is desirable and cannot be regarded as anything more than a step in the right direction.

² The secondary-school course envisaged in this paper is the kind which ends at sixteen or so.

and as perfectly as possible, with everybody taking part and taking turns at duties of Sanctuary and Sacristy; and this would be fully possible only in boarding schools. Even in day schools one could hope for a chapel and a corporate religious life of some kind. In any case one would ask for a good knowledge of the Mass from all points of view, for a familiarity with the Missal and some insight into its beauties which will involve some notions about the Old Testament, for some acquaintance with plain chant if any purposes could be found for it in the life of the school, and for an adequate notion of the feasts and seasons of the ecclesiastical year. Also plenty of fresh guidance about things like going to confession, and somehow or other a good selection of English hymns in constant use. Either here or in the Church history department, it would be well to make an occasional excursion into the *historical* aspect of the liturgy and the Sacraments—just enough to show how modern Catholicism is one thing with the Catholicism of the New Testament, notwithstanding the vast difference in external details. In these various ways secondary school students might arrive at a good understanding of the why and wherefore of all the things they do and see done in church.

And now (you will be asking) where does Doctrine come in?

Well a good deal depends upon what is meant by that word, Doctrine. There is doctrine in a narrative, doctrine in a dramatic action. If by doctrine you mean simply the teachings of the Church, I say there is plenty of doctrine in the Gospels and in the history of the Church; and also plenty in the Mass and the Missal and the Sacraments. It is there already, and only needs to be pointed out and commented upon at appropriate occasions as they arise in the course of study. Such a doctrinal commentary would naturally be provided by the Catechism, which is in its rightful place when it is used in a secondary school, and again when it is used in church. Our present Catechism is better than the Catechisms in use in most countries, but it is unnecessarily long, and labours under the disadvantage of being written in some parts for babies and in other parts for highly intelligent adults. For secondary school purposes as well as for use in church, the ideal Catechism would be something shorter, and written as if for intelligent children of thirteen or fourteen, which also represents pretty well the level of intelligence reached by the average adult.

But possibly by that word "Doctrine" you mean something more than is to be found in the Catechism. Perhaps what you are asking for is a systematic course of scientific theology, the theology of the professional theologian with its technical terms and definitions and precise formulations and logical divisions and proofs—a course of something like seminary theology, in

fact, as far as such a thing can be done in a secondary school. If so, I cannot agree. I think it is a pity to attempt too much scientific theology, whether dogmatic or moral, with the ordinary laity. There is quite enough of it in the Catechism for practical purposes, and probably too much of it in sermons and text-books and school instruction generally.

Please do not imagine from this that I am denying the usefulness of scientific theology, still less questioning its validity.

Let me explain. It is all a matter of the using of words. There are two ways of using words, two kinds of human language.

On the one hand there is the language of science: the language of logical and precise statement, which uses a word to express one meaning only, a meaning accurate and definable. We can all recognize something noble and at the same time humble about the true scientific attitude of mind, and nothing is more striking about it than its complete accuracy and precision in the use of words. It keeps its words to one level of meaning; they have length and breadth but not depth; in describing the object, everything is sacrificed to an exactness of statement such as will make misunderstanding impossible. The professional theologian as such aims at using this scientific language and rightly refuses to use any other.

On the other hand there is the language of life and literature, in which words are alive and can suggest more than they say. In ordinary life and conversation, as in poetry, a word or a phrase may convey several meanings at once, on different levels or planes; and it may also be laden with special associations which add to all its meanings a richness and vividness to which science cannot aspire. This language, too, has its own kind of accuracy and precision—it is a psychological precision, the precision of finding exactly the right words for what one has in mind. Nevertheless, because of that very richness, that three-dimensional quality, the words that are made flesh in life and in literature always remain open to misunderstanding. And, of course, this language of life and of literature is the language that has power. It is creative. Moreover, this (as far as the records tell us) is the kind of language that our Lord Himself has invariably used, whether during His life on earth, or since then on the occasions of His appearances to the saints.

Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?

Francis, go and rebuild My church which thou seest is falling in ruins.

It is this language that the Catholic religion, like every other religion, uses naturally. The Catholic religion often finds it necessary to use a scientific language, too, chiefly in order to define

her teaching in the face of some heresy or other; and even when the Church is not drawing up definitions herself, the theologians are always busy at it in their own way. Scientific theology must needs be studied by priests, lest they should slip into heresies in preaching and explaining the Faith. For the same reason I think that anyone who is going to teach religion, even lay-teachers, needs to have a certain acquaintance with scientific theology. But it may be that owing perhaps to the permanent atmosphere of religious controversy that has prevailed since the Reformation, this systematized and scientific theology of the seminary has been carried over too bodily into popular instruction. And as for the ordinary faithful and ordinary school children, I believe it would be better if they learned the Faith as men learned it from the Apostles—that is, through the medium of the story of Christ's life and through the Sacraments and the Mass.

Life instead of mere words—reality instead of verbalism—things instead of mere printed matter. I suppose that is what we all desire to aim at in education, and especially in religious education. The great enemy is the parrot-system; but I have not said much about that in this paper because, as far as my own observation goes, our secondary schools for boys are singularly free from the parrot-system. The foregoing suggestions as to syllabus are chiefly directed towards the removal of elements which seem to be unsuitable and non-nutritious for the youthful mind. Even if all the suggestions were adopted, I should not expect any startling difference in the number of pupils who keep up religious practice when school-days are over. But we might perhaps hope for a still deeper and more intelligent Catholic life in those who do keep it up. And what we might expect ultimately (I think) would be more and more converts to the Church, for at present the ordinary Englishman undoubtedly finds us too argumentative, too proud of our own logic, too scornful of his own illogical loyalties, too fond of technical language and *a priori* arguments, too cocksure in drawing conclusions from the teachings of the Church. He can see and feel a divine glow at the heart of Catholicism, but his heart fails him at the thicket of barbed wire we set up all around it.

What we all want to see is a well-instructed Catholic laity. Does this mean, Catholics who can distinguish the "matter" and the "form" in each of the Sacraments, and who can tell you how many sorts of lies there are, and give you the correct name for an untruth uttered in fun? Or does it not rather mean Catholics who can serve Mass and use their Missal with appreciation, and who understand the origin and the extent of the authority of the Church?

F. H. DRINKWATER.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The
First Decade of
Peace.

The tenth anniversary of the Armistice is at hand, naturally suggesting a survey of what these ten years of peace have brought us. Although the passion and pride and general folly

of mankind have been abundantly illustrated by every nation both in its internal and external relations, it is not undue optimism to conclude that international peace, to secure which the world has expended so much blood and treasure, is becoming gradually more assured. Our view is confirmed, not indeed by the curious ways of politicians, who do not allow the formal abandonment of force as a means and measure of security to interfere with their rivalry in armaments, but by the growing irritation of public opinion against such inconsistency and the practically universal demand that the "secret diplomacy," of which the abortive Anglo-French Naval Pact furnished a typical example, should be given up once for all. The people who have to fight in the event of war are now a good deal more alive to the necessity of keeping control over those who for the moment represent them. They are not satisfied that those whose profession is warfare are the most suitable persons to discuss disarmament. That famous Preparatory Commission has met over 400 times, with little practical result, simply because the several Governments cannot rid themselves of the spectre of possible warfare, showing that none of them really believes that the others are sincere in renouncing it. This startling discrepancy between profession and practice has been so emphasized by the Kellogg Pact that even the incurious, apathetic man in the street, whose thoughts rarely stray beyond his surroundings, is taking notice. The Pact declares that, whatever be the nature and origin of international disputes, they shall never henceforth be resolved *except by pacific means*. If the tax-payer—French, English, American—keeps on asking: "Why then such armaments?" until he gets an answer, at least and at last the stigma of insincerity which now rests upon his Government will be removed. As it is, politicians are always trying to see how much they can retain, rather than how much they can get rid of, in the matter of armaments.

Need
of Ethical
Guidance.

The decade of Peace has witnessed many experiments in the search of national security, many of them ill-advised because dictated by hatred and desire of revenge, none of them

giving sufficient heed to the Papal plan of discarding the means of aggression by mutual disarmament and of establishing a Code of International Law to be administered by the International Court. The Court is there, but the law has not yet been codified,

whilst the defeated nations alone have reduced their armaments, on the clear understanding that the rest would follow suit. If they do not, they cannot expect that other provisions of the Versailles Treaty will be held valid and the very foundations of post-war Europe will be undermined. It is in virtue of that treaty that universal reduction of armaments is demanded and the treaty is a public instrument which must be interpreted by public law, not according to the prejudices and interests of its framers. How welcome, at this juncture of affairs, not only to Catholics but to right-thinking men of all beliefs, would be an authoritative declaration from the greatest moral power in the world on the ethics of international intercourse. Men are looking for guidance, such guidance as Pope Leo XIII. gave to the world of industry in his great Labour encyclicals, still happily bearing fruit. The growing solidarity of the world and the experiences of the war have created a host of new problems which need definite solution. It is well known that, as long ago as 1870, the famous David Urquhart presented a *Postulatum* to the Vatican Council, begging for an exposition of Christian International Law, which, but for the unhappy interruption of the Council, might have had a most beneficial result. The need for such a Restatement of Principles has not grown less.

**War can
be Just.** It is possible that the first thing that the Sovereign Pontiff would find it necessary to declare would be the righteousness of war under certain clear conditions. The non-Catholic world is often the prey of mere sentiment in this matter.

That zealous association for the re-christianizing of society, called C.O.P.E.C. resolved, in April, 1924, that: "All war is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ," and innumerable Nonconformist gatherings denounce without any qualification the "sin" or "crime" of war. For instance, on October 10th, the Congregational Union at Leeds passed a resolution which begins as follows:—"This Assembly, having affirmed its conviction that war is a crime against humanity and therefore contrary to the mind of Christ" . . . General statements like these are simply not true: they would brand as criminal some of the noblest actions of mankind; they imply that the Church of God in teaching and practice has at times fostered or condoned what is sinful. And the statement that all war is intrinsically immoral, running counter as it does to common sense and common experience, forms a radical flaw in the well-meant and zealous arguments of many non-Catholic pacifists. They are not logical, for if the State can employ policemen to repress internal disorder by force, it can employ soldiers to protect its interests against external aggression. But, having

vindicated the right and duty of self-defence, Catholic teaching is very clear and very strict in defining its limits. A restatement of the conditions of just warfare in the modern world would have to take account of a number of circumstances,—such as its enhanced barbarity, its abolition of the distinction between combatants and non-combatants and its far-reaching effects upon non-belligerents—which the ancient authors had not to contemplate.

Moral Uncertainties. The fierce ebullitions of nationalism resulting from the war, the implication that a narrow patriotism is not only enough but all in all, the oblivion of the claims of humanity as a whole, call for the control of definite and right principles. No institution can be better fitted than the supra-national, universal Church, which has always insisted on the rights of the family in respect to the State, to expound the rights of the nation as regards the complexus of its fellow nations and to draw the line between proper self-regard and blind selfishness. And as regards the individual citizen in the perplexing circumstances of a State at war—his responsibilities, his duties, the limits of sacrifice demanded of him, his conduct in the field, his dispositions towards the foe,—nowhere amid the maze of novel situations can he find right and consistent moral guidance save from the accredited moral Teacher of mankind. What standing, for instance, has the conscientious objector? How far in a democracy is the individual citizen responsible for the sins of his Government? Can a man hire himself to fight for a country not his own? Can a trader make and sell munitions without caring to what use they are put? A host of questions of the sort are awaiting authoritative answers or the exposition of principles which will enable them to be solved. We do not doubt that the next General Council will devote its attention to them, but, meanwhile, the time seems to be ripe for a more immediate restatement of the Church's view on the problems of war and peace. Our ten years' experience has made clear the various tendencies, some good, some evil, which are influencing mankind—the new spirit of international co-operation and good will checked on every side by national exclusiveness and the futile search for security by military strength. The one positive achievement of the war—The League of Nations—is regarded with suspicion by many Catholics on religious or political grounds, and because of its dissociation with the moral power of the Papacy. Here, too, guidance is needed. If the Catholics of the world under the guidance of Rome were to unite in recognizing, as the Catholic Hierarchy of England once formally recognized (Low Week, 1924), "that in the League of Nations a real endeavour is

being made to carry into effect those principles of justice and good will which the Catholic Church, by the voice of the Holy See, has never failed to urge upon the conscience of the world," and were to try to supplement its defects and correct its errors, then immense additional vitality would be given to an organization which, in spite of all handicaps, has laboured successfully to preserve peace.

**The Value
of the
League of Nations.**

It seems, then, a little lacking in a due sense of proportion for the British representatives at Geneva to complain of the expenses of the League. It is true that Great Britain pays the largest individual contribution: on the other hand, it stands to gain the most from the stabilizing of peace due to the League. In comparison with the cost of a warship, the annual sum of £120,000 for constructive work is almost negligible. Some statistician has calculated that we pay every year £59 5s. per head for war and only 2½d. per head for peace! If we gave up the construction of a single battleship, we should save enough to pay our League subscription for 58 years. It is the League that saves us from further taxation for defence and will greatly reduce our present taxation by every increase in security. The point is, not so much what we are spending as, what value we are getting for our money. Every year, in spite of alarms and excursions, Europe is becoming more stabilized, with a sense of safety which was unknown before the war. Every year the great international commissions bring together representatives of the nations for the common tasks of humanity. Before the existence of the League what chance had the minor states of the world to get their grievances heard and their needs heeded? Now they have access to the great political conferences of the Assembly and can take their share with the strongest. And if it were not for the League, how could the racial minorities in many States plead for justice before the world?

Minorities.

An attempt was made during the Assembly to have a Minorities Commission appointed on the lines of the Mandates Commission, to keep an eye upon the fulfilment of the promises made in the various Peace Treaties to safeguard their rights. But the proposal met with opposition from the States, some half-dozen in number, affected by these treaties, on the reasonable grounds that countries like Germany, Spain and Italy, which also rule over racial aliens, would be exempt from supervision. Until these States consent to have their treatment of minorities scrutinized like the others, that suggestion is likely to remain unheeded. It is useful to note that, whereas before the war a hundred

million people were living under alien rule, that number has now been reduced to one-fifth. Meanwhile, the duty of a State towards members of another race under its sway has never been more eloquently expressed than by the Italian representative at the 1920 Peace Conference, and his words are worth recalling:—

Like other Great Powers Italy is not bound by any legal stipulation to observe these conditions [regarding the rights of minorities] but in my opinion she is, by reason of those liberal traditions which are her glory and her privilege, under a great moral obligation to act in the same way. Those people of alien nationality who are united to us must know that all idea of oppression or denationalization is foreign to us; that their language and their cultural institutions will be respected and that their administrative officials will enjoy all the privileges resulting from our liberal and democratic legislation. To the population of German South Tirol we can give the assurance that we shall never introduce there a rule of police compulsion, of persecution and tyranny, such as the inhabitants of Istria and the Trentino were subjected to for so many years by the Austrian Government.

The enlightened policy thus set forth is better calculated to make loyal citizens than a uniformity of speech and culture produced by oppression.

**The Full
Meaning of
the Pact.**

Before leaving the consideration of certain aspects of the League Assembly, it may be worth while to note one effect of the Paris Pact which gives it its unique significance. After pointing out that the Pact has reinforced and blocked loopholes in the League Covenant M. Politis, the Greek delegate, said: "by renouncing war as an instrument of policy, the States have abandoned a prerogative of sovereignty hitherto held essential." This is, in a sense, due to a recognition that world-peace is a more important aim than any national interest. Only the defence of national existence itself can nowadays justify a nation taking the law into its own hands. For the first time, the superior claims of the common welfare have been heeded, and the sword will never more be thrown into the scale of justice. *If the Pact is observed.* The process of ratification by the various Governments has now to be gone through and extreme nationalists everywhere will demand back the sacred right of being judges in their own cause. In America, before even considering the Pact, the Houses are to discuss making enormous additions to a Navy the only use of which is to protect American commerce against problematical foes. It would seem that the full implications of the Pact which Mr. Kellogg has got the world to sign are least of all understood in his own country.

**The Religious
Issue
in America.**

It is gratifying to notice that the invocation of religious bigotry to assist in the opposition to Mr. Smith's candidature for the American presidency is condemned, sincerely if inconsistently, by all reputable English papers. They are not consistent, for they do not repudiate the same religious bigotry that enters into the English Constitution and denies freedom of conscience to their monarch. But since that anti-Catholic provision is actually embodied in the Revolution Settlement, whereas on the contrary the American constitution makes a boast of religious toleration, the anti-Catholics in the States show the greater inconsistency. This survival or recrudescence of an obsolete mentality is alarming thoughtful people of all creeds in America and many honest non-Catholics of standing are combining with members of the Church to form an association in defence of religious liberty. The movement as detailed in the pages of the American weeklies—*The Commonweal* and *America*—is of immense significance. "The most dangerous kind of bigotry," says the latter (Sept. 29th), "is honest bigotry": that which is sincere, though founded on error and ignorance. It is boundless, for the comparative handful of malicious and evil-minded anti-Catholics,—men whom *The Commonweal* (Sept. 19th) stigmatizes as "furtive, cowardly, anonymous, unprincipled, avaricious scoundrels: workers in the darkness, poisoners of the wells of truth"—have been able to spread their calumnies about Catholicism just because of the abysmal ignorance of millions of Americans of the real tenets and ethos of the Faith,—and possibly of Christianity itself. If there are some upright men engaged in the same vile campaign, they are religious fanatics whom blind and untempered zeal for what they think the truth has made incapable of sound judgment. *America* pertinently illustrates the quasi-invincible ignorance even of the educated, by citing the case of a book about Catholicism by a Protestant Professor of Theology which not only betrayed the author's incomprehension of ordinary points of doctrine and morals, but also his unteachableness, since his answer to his critic only exhibited a lower depth of ignorance. Both these Catholic journals, far-seeing and ably-conducted as they are, welcome the anti-Catholic campaign as giving an opportunity, in book, pamphlet and lecture, not only for stating the Catholic case, but also for vindicating the American Constitution against a powerful and widespread attempt to distort and degrade it.

**Religious
Extravagance
in U.S.A.**

It has often been remarked that views and tendencies which keep within the bounds of moderation in the land of their origin escape all control when they pass beyond the seas. The Belfast Orangeman at his worst is meek and gentle compared

to his antetype in Canada and Australia. The British Methodist, in spite of John Wesley's strong anti-Catholic bias, lives at peace with his Catholic neighbours and often gives evidence of a true evangelical spirit in his protest against the injustice and corruption of the day, whereas the American Methodist, whether he confines his activities to the States or proselytizes in Europe, is a byword for bigotry and bitterness. The English crusade against the evils of strong drink degenerates into total Prohibition in America, and notoriously, the sectarian spirit which issues from free-thought in religion, runs to all extremes in the country which produced Mrs. Eddy, the Holy Rollers, the Four-Square Gospel and countless similar aberrations of religious sentiment. It is natural that these extravagances, combined with sadder developments of materialism and atheism, should resent the presence amongst them of the Catholic Church, consistent, unchanging, supernatural, rooted in the past, energizing in the present, preparing for the future, a standing challenge to the rebellious and self-willed, a constant reproach to the sensual and earthly minded. The Church takes their attacks as a matter of course and as a means of advance: the floods beat upon that house in vain. And the State in America may come to recognize that its own permanence and welfare are bound up with the prosperity of the Church.

**The
"Scanning of
Error" helpful to
Truth.** The religious issue at home, the fortunes of the Faith in this country, are in comparison full of hope and promise. The disintegration

of Protestantism continues apace. It may seem unkind to refer, as we frequently do, to the logical absurdities of the Anglican position, to the disingenuous inconsistencies which mark the efforts of its apologists. It seems so contrary to the kindly spirit evinced by Keble towards the Catholic Church in his exhortation to his co-religionists to "speak gently of our sister's fall." And it would be, if Anglicanism or any of the Protestant sects were indeed in any such relationship towards us. But it is not so: as corporate bodies they are enemies of the Church of Christ: they deny her God-given prerogatives: they reject her motherly guidance and care: they repudiate the principles on which she is founded and much of the revelation she transmits: consequently, although their members know no better and are conscientious in their rejection of "Rome," their good-faith cannot give their various affiliations any ecclesiastical standing. In our eyes, they are merely groups of people trying to serve God outside the Fold and our dearest wish is to bring them in so that they may serve God better. As they are all in error of one sort or another it is our business, who have the truth, to do what we can to bring their errors home

to them; a task which is often most easily performed by showing, according to a Euclidean method, that they issue in absurdity.

**The Anglican
Bishops' Move.**

It is surely absurd that an institution which was called into being and kept in subordination by the State should, after three or four centuries of subjection, begin to assert its "spiritual independence." Up to about fifty or sixty years ago the Anglican Church had been quite content with its State establishment: the present revolt, which is by no means universal, dates from the time when the Tractarians showed what a Church professing to be Christian should be. Ever since Elizabeth's Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, the Crown has constantly intervened to determine what the doctrine and worship of the Church of England should be. Although its Bishops are "consecrated" by their fellows, still the founders of their line were State nominees, the invalidity of whose consecration had to be made good by Act of Parliament, and, one and all, they do homage to the lay Head of their Church for their spiritual as well as their temporal endowments. To a Hierarchy thus instituted came the embarrassing experience of twice having a Prayer-Book, which they had approved and sponsored, rejected by Parliament, the final authority of their Church. Faced with the dilemma of rebellion or submission—neither of which courses was in the circumstances tolerable—the Bishops have temporized and have resolved, though not unanimously, "informally" and "provisionally," with the assent of their diocesan Synods and the consent of their Parochial Councils, to sanction deviations from the Prayer-Book of 1662 within the limits of the Prayer-Book of 1928. For this constructive defiance of the law of the Church as decided by Parliament, they are denounced by Sir W. Joynson Hicks and applauded by Lord Birkenhead, abuse and commendation which are echoed in various degrees by members of their flocks in the Press. But they have gained time and staved off an awkward decision, and as future action will not be concerted but individual, the results will probably escape public notice unless, what is unlikely, some Protestant zealot institutes law-proceedings against some violator of the canon of 1662, which is constantly violated as it is. By delay the Bishops may save—the Church!

**Anglicanism
essentially a
State Church.**

A simple way out of the Anglican *impasse* would obviously be the repeal of the Acts of Uniformity, the legislation whereby the civil power, for the first time in Christian history, usurped the function of defining and enforcing spiritual doctrine and practice. These Acts alone determine the character of

Anglicanism as wholly distinct from the religion which it was meant to displace and into whose material possessions it was intruded. Certain Anglicans now feel, what their ancestors should have felt from the beginning, that such an essential subordination of the spiritual to the temporal is wholly incompatible with the nature of the Church Christ founded: others, affecting to regard the Church as simply the State in its religious aspect, are quite content with things as they are. Historically and logically the position of the latter is unassailable, and the destruction of the State connection by the repeal, as distinct from the modification, of the Acts which established the Church would mean the end of Anglicanism as an organized body. The remedy would, therefore, be not only simple but suicidal, and we cannot imagine the Protestant party ever consenting to it. Things will remain as they are, until those Churchmen who chafe under civil rule become strong enough to defy it and zealous enough to endure the disendowment which would surely follow. Meanwhile, Anglicanism in its domestic concerns is wholly amenable to the civil law. The discretion which the majority of the Bishops propose to exercise in dispensing with the Canons of the Book of 1662 does not in fact lie within their competence. A letter to the *Morning Post* (Oct. 11th) appositely calls attention to the deliberate decision of the Royal Commission of Ecclesiastical Discipline, presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury, out of which came the endeavour to revise the Prayer-Book. Its report declares:—

There cannot, in our opinion, be any doubt that the Acts of Uniformity bind the Bishops as well as other clergymen; and that the law does not recognize any right in a Bishop to override the provisions as to services, rites, and ceremonies contained in those Acts. . . At the present stage it is enough to say that though Bishops have from time to time used a certain liberty of action with a view to relax the stringency of the Acts of Uniformity, it does not appear to us that there is any legal ground for assuming that, apart from statutory provision, the Bishop of a diocese has an inherent right to dispense the clergy from observing the provisions of those Acts. Such an assumption would, in our opinion, be inconsistent with the constitutional relations of Church and State in England.

In other words, inconsistent with the fact that, in Anglicanism, ecclesiastical and civil law are one, springing from the one single source, the Crown in Parliament.

**The Cheltenham
Church
Congress.**

So much for discipline in this singular Church. The object of the Cheltenham Church Congress (Oct. 2nd to Oct. 5th incl.) was to determine, as far as possible, its doctrinal status in regard to other religious bodies. "The Anglican Communion: Past, Present and Future," was the general theme for discussion, and in order the more fully to ascertain where it stood, the co-operation, not only of its own conflicting sections but also of the Nonconformists, and even of the Eastern Church was hopefully sought. Of course, all that emerged from the four days' discussion was that nobody could say for certain,—could say, that is, in a way and with a force able to convince all dissidents—what *was* the real essence of Anglicanism. Theories abounded: the conflicting groups ventilated their general views—the Modernists unexpectedly unaggressive, the others tentative, vague and inconsistent. The most heretical, from the Catholic standpoint, was an "Anglo-Catholic," Mr. N. P. Williams, who freely abandoned the Christian doctrine of the Fall. The President, the Bishop of Gloucester, whose anti-Papal complex found unhappy expression once or twice, pleaded for "a rich variety of religious life," and declared that Anglicanism "did not want to be without Anglo-Catholics or Evangelicals or Modernists or Christian Socialists." And, strange to say, many prominent "Anglo-Catholics" at the Congress dissociated themselves from the protest, which Lord Halifax and upwards of one thousand "Anglo-Catholic" clergymen made, against allowing Modernists the right to interpret the doctrines of Anglicanism. The policy, which under the plea for "a rich variety of religious life" gives equal status in the same Church to contradictory doctrines is surely a pathetic confession of inability to distinguish true from false and, therefore, to speak in the name of the God of Truth. Meanwhile, with quite extraordinary optimism, the Archbishops' Doctrinal Commission, which represents all "schools of thought" in the Establishment and which has been labouring for four or five years to reconcile them, issued, during the Congress, its annual report and declared itself "greatly encouraged in its hope that, *given time for really full discussion*, it may greatly assist the movement towards unity in the Church of England." Meanwhile, the Anglican faithful must wait to know, amongst other things, whether or not their Church teaches that Christ is truly God or that He is really present in the Holy Eucharist.

**Evading
The
Truth.**

A writer in *The Times* (Oct. 6th) summed up the Congress in characteristic Anglican fashion. After stating (italics ours) that at the Reformation "the Church of England retained all that was *conceived to be* necessary for the maintenance of its

historic place in Christendom," he goes on to demolish that pretence in the same sentence by adding, "but it deliberately committed itself to *new ventures in its doctrinal statements, order of worship and organization* as the Church of the Nation." Therefore, surely, it deliberately severed itself from the old Church and did *not* maintain its historic place in Christendom: that place was still retained by the persecuted remnant which never abandoned the faith and worship of its forefathers. However, the writer proceeds to describe the Elizabethan creation in terms which mark it off even more clearly from the historic Church, and, incidentally, explain its condition of doctrinal and disciplinary chaos. "A Church which makes its final appeal to Scripture, [i.e., to individual interpretation of a document often obscure and ambiguous] in which the rights of conscience are vindicated, liberty of thought exercised and the demands of sound learning acknowledged; [as if all that were incompatible with the recognition of a divine teaching authority] must be prepared to bear the responsibilities of the freedom it allows its members." The Establishment is certainly bearing those consequences in full measure and will continue to bear them until its inevitable disruption. "With the great elemental facts of the Christian faith accepted," he goes on, complacently ignoring the denial by many of precisely these elemental facts, "there will be diversity of opinion in almost every secondary matter." Those who use this old subterfuge of distinguishing between primary and secondary articles of faith forget the Apostle's warning—"He that offendeth in one, offendeth in all." Then follows the usual ignorant allusion to the Catholic system—"Complete agreement in every point of doctrine is easy for those who are content to comply with the behests of external authority." But what if that external authority is the authority which Christ exercised during His life and committed to His representatives for all time, so that, precisely, unity of doctrine should be maintained? Finally, for the whole article is but a repetition of these false assumptions and illogical deductions,—"A Church which encourages liberty *must be comprehensive* [or, more plainly, must give up any pretence to teach] and show how, in spite of real differences, men can live in fellowship in the unity of the same Spirit." Considering that the Spirit here mentioned is the Spirit of Truth, it seems little short of blasphemy to represent Him as condoning the multiplied errors of Anglicanism. The writer is again essaying the task which generations of earnest men have constantly tried in vain—to hide from himself by fine-sounding but vaporous language the inevitable results of religious free-thinking.

**A Standing
Puzzle.**

Assuredly all three political parties desire the welfare and happiness of the British people. They are one in motive when they put forth their several plans for benefiting the nation.

It would be possible to discover a certain amount of common ground in these projects, but it would be too much to expect that their authors should combine to put through the remedies on which they are agreed. As soon as minds pass from the general to the particular, from principle to detail, they tend to slip back again into party grooves. Hence questions like the revival and spread of our chief industry, agriculture, are never discussed on their merits and with a single view to getting them solved, and we go on for years confronted with the hopeless spectacle of millions of idle hands and vast areas of idle lands. Our rulers apparently cannot bring them into fruitful combination. A few thousands were shipped to Canada, at great expense: further emigration is being planned; but emigration from town to country within the boundaries of England seems to be an impracticable policy. Yet on that basis, and no other, can the prosperity of the country be firmly re-established. Why is it, we ask with genuine wonder, and perhaps a Socialist will reply, that the State can never, outside the public services, succeed as an employer of labour, whilst even the smallest Capitalist can generally make ends meet?

**The
Penalty of
Death.**

An agitation is on foot for the abolition of the death-penalty. It is a matter for open discussion, for no law of Christian morality prescribes that particular form of retribution for

serious crime. At the same time the question is apt to be obscured by false sentimentality, and moral considerations ignored. Because public opinion has gradually limited the infliction of that penalty to cases of wilful murder and high treason, it is assumed that the process of evolution should not stop there. But, whilst it is possible that the State may substitute other penalties for such crimes, we must not declare that it is going beyond its rights in retaining the punishment of death. The right of the sword is an essential prerogative of the civil power, and there is nothing, given due occasion, unjust or arbitrary in its exercise thereof. Punishment has three aspects—it vindicates violated moral order, it corrects the ill-doer, it deters others from imitating him and himself from repeating his offence—and of these three the first is the most important, and yet the most frequently ignored in discussion. To declare that no crime can be so atrocious as to justify the death-penalty is to affront common sense and common experience.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Contraception, The Immorality of [Dr. John A. Ryan in *Ecclesiastical Review*, Oct. 1928, p. 408].

Justice, The Administration of [Rev. D. Barry in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Oct. 1928, p. 373].

Scandal, The Ethics of [J. Elliot Ross, C.S.P., in *Ecclesiastical Review*, Oct. 1928, p. 408].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Action Française, continued revolt against the Pope [A. Lugan in *Catholic World*, Oct. 1928, p. 72].

"**Comprehensiveness**," Dr. Major on [*Tablet*, Oct. 13, 1928, p. 469].

Ludwig's, Herr, blasphemous Life of Christ exposed [C. C. Martindale's *Catholic Times* articles in *Catholic Mind*, Sept. 22, 1928].

Perversion of History by a Carlisle Pageant [Dom B. McLaughlin in *Tablet*, Oct. 13, 1928, p. 470].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Alsace, Catholicism in [D. Gwynn in *Blackfriars*, Oct. 1928, p. 583].

Bible-reading in the Early Church [Dr. J. P. Arendzen in *Catholic Gazette*, Oct. 1928, p. 315].

Censorship Bill in Ireland: How to amend [*Catholic Pictorial*, Sept. 1928, pp. 236 and 243].

Culture: the want and the need of it, in Education [E. Lester, S.J., in *Tablet*, Oct. 6, 1928, p. 415].

Emancipation, Restricted limits of [B. J. d'Adhemar, S.J., *Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, Oct. 1928, p. 316].

Erasmus, In Defence of [N. M. Wilby in *Blackfriars*, Oct. 1928, p. 617].

Eugenics, a Plea for Christian [Edith Seymour in *Catholic Times*, Oct. 5, 1928, p. 14: criticized, *ibid.*, Oct. 19, pp. 14, 15].

France, The Religious Revival in, Details of [Comtesse de Courson in *Dublin Review*, Oct. 1928, p. 245].

Monroe Doctrine, Legality of [L. Izaga in *Razon y Fé*, Oct. 10, 1928, p. 5].

Russian Church, State of, in 1917 [*Irenikon*, July—Sept. 1928, p. 271].

REVIEWS

—FRANCISCAN LITERATURE

THE recent centenary of St. Francis has drawn attention to the noble work of the Franciscan Fathers in many branches, and in many parts of the world. We have received the *Report of the Ninth Annual Meeting* of the Franciscan Education Conference at Athol Springs, New York, in July, 1927 (published by the Conference, Capuchin College, Brookland, Washington, D.C.). In addition to a full account of the six sessions, we are given a complete list of the literary productions of American Franciscans for 1927, and certainly it is a list of which any religious order might well be proud. There follow the papers read at the Conference; these, too, speak well for the successors of St. Bonaventure in America. Their titles are: 1. How St. Francis of Assisi won the Heart of the World. 2. Preaching—The Opus Franciscanum. 3. Franciscan Preaching in the Past. 4. The Course of Homiletics in our Curriculum. 5. The Franciscan Mission. 6. The History of Franciscan Preaching and of Franciscan Preachers (1209-1927).

This last study occupies by far the greater portion of the Report, and is in itself so valuable that it has been published apart: *The History of Franciscan Preaching and of Franciscan Preachers* (1209-1927); a bio-bibliographical study, by Anscar Zawart, O.M.Cap (Wagner, \$1.50); forming No. 7 of the series of Franciscan Studies. It is divided into two parts. 1. Before the Reformation; 2. After the Reformation till the present day. To a very great extent it is a history of the work of the Franciscans, looked at from a particular angle; and is a work of reference rather than an essay, full of learning and with most ample bibliographies. The index alone occupies ten closely-printed pages, and consists chiefly of the names of Franciscan preachers who have taught the word of God with effect in various parts of the world.

In quite another field is a charming book *Franciscan Mysticism*, a translation by Dom Basil Whelan from the French edition of the work, *Mystical Theology*, by Brother Boniface Maes (1669). (Sheed and Ward, 2/6 net.) The original has had a great vogue, both in the age of the author and since, and it is well that in these days, when interest in mysticism is so evident, that the safe guides of the past should be within the reach of students. After an examination of mysticism in general, which is defined as "the practical science which teaches us to love God and to hate ourselves," the author divides his work into two parts, 1. The Active Life, and 2. The Contemplative Life. The first is dismissed in a few pages; the second gives a training in contemplation, the effects

which it produces, the trials it imposes, and its perils. A more practical handling of subjects so sublime can scarcely be imagined; while the standard divisions of mystical theologians are never forgotten, Brother Boniface, evidently drawing from experience, has divisions all his own, reduced to great simplicity.

Students of Franciscan history and Franciscan spirit cannot afford to pass over the *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, a quarterly publication of the Fathers of the College of St. Bonaventure, Quaracchi, near Florence, which is now in its twenty-first year, the annual subscription 40 lire. It is issued along the lines of other learned periodicals of its kind, and contains discussions, reprinted documents, chronicles of historical discovery, reviews of books, which speak well for the spirit of devoted research and for the learning of its contributors.

2—THE MEXICAN PERSECUTION¹

THE world at large continues to ignore or misrepresent the grievous persecution of Christianity which the Federal Government of the United States of Mexico has been carrying on in that country for three or four years. For some reason, it suits the secular press to look upon the occurrence as an emancipation of a priest-ridden people and a rescue of a feeble State from ecclesiastical encroachment. The Mexican authorities do their best by assiduous propaganda to spread this view, and they are aided by anti-Catholics everywhere, particularly by that bigoted political corporation, the American Methodist Church. Of course, the Catholic side has been frequently and ably set forth, although the vast machinery of the Church has not been formally employed. But the lamb is never believed in its own cause: the wolf always knows better. However, when a publicist of the eminence of Captain McCullagh, who has done more than any single individual to expose the Soviet tyranny, essays a similar service to Catholic Mexico, even bigotry must surely lend an ear. *Red Mexico* is the result of first-hand and prolonged investigations by an accomplished journalist, skilled to get at the core of things and to distinguish fact from camouflage, and, although in some cases adequate documentation is wanting, the narrative on the whole bears the stamp of absolute truth, and, indeed, the indictment is generally based upon actual experience and the avowals of the criminals themselves. Criminal, indeed, on Capt. McCullagh's showing, is the record and character of Calles and his chief associates, and atrocious in the extreme is their treatment of the hapless nation over which they tyrannize. But they are not alone at the bar of

¹ *Red Mexico*. By Francis McCullagh. London: Brentano's. Illustrated. Pp. xxiv. 33s. Price, 15s. net.

justice. A singular and sinister feature of the author's elaborate charge is the formal share which certain American influences, religious, political and financial, have had in this and previous anti-Catholic outbursts of savagery in Mexico. At the door of President Wilson, whom some of us would like to consider a high-principled, if somewhat narrow-minded, man, lies the guilt of having fostered the revolutionary elements in Mexico at a time when law and order had a chance of being re-established. And other more sordid interests connected with finance have apparently laboured long and successfully to keep Mexico unsettled and therefore an easy prey for the exploiter. These incriminations, which tell so heavily against America's good name, although the author explicitly excludes the nation as such from the shame of them, are the more credible because honest Americans, in the Press and elsewhere, have long acknowledged and deplored them. The only remedy seems to be the growth of an enlightened public opinion on foreign affairs in the States, and to this growth Captain McCullagh's book, if read without prejudice, should powerfully contribute. There are marks, as we have hinted, of the haste of the journalist in its pages, a certain want of proportion in the space allotted to events, and one desiderates further confirmatory references. But in its main lines the exposure is very damning, and, if it does not provoke a healthy reaction against the would-be destroyers of Mexico's liberty and faith, we shall be inclined to despair of the future of the civilized world. Catholics will do great service to truth and justice by getting this book into all the public libraries.

3—BIBLE STUDY¹

THE courageous enterprise of producing a readable version of the Holy Scriptures, accurate, critical, well-annotated, worthily-printed, and edited with all the care that its importance demands, has made a notable advance with the publication of St. Matthew's Gospel. The New Testament, which is intended to occupy four volumes, is now three-parts finished: only St. Luke, St. John, and The Acts remain to be published. When the whole has been issued, the promoters have in view the production of a one-volume edition at a moderate price, in which the English Catholic reader will for the first time have the New Testament record put before him compendiously, free from the mistakes and obscurity of a faulty translation and from the unsightliness of an archaic arrangement. Meanwhile in this large and handsome volume, Dr. Dean of Upholland has provided an

¹ *The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures: New Testament, Vol. I., Part I., The Gospel according to St. Matthew. Translated and Edited by the Very Rev. Joseph Dean, D.D., Ph.D. Pp. xxxv. 150. Price, 4s. (paper), 5s. (boards).*

admirable version of St. Matthew's Gospel, equipped with a great variety of helps—introduction, notes and an appendix—for its thorough understanding. The Introduction, contributed by one of the General Editors, Father Lattey, S.J., discusses fully, in the light of tradition and of modern research, the various problems connected with the Gospel—authorship, composition, date and early references, characteristics, etc.—and enables the reader to appreciate accurately the aim and method of the inspired author. A more general but very important question is raised in the Appendix, also by Father Lattey,—“The Place of Memory in the Composition of the Synoptic Gospels”—which is in substance a criticism of the arbitrary methods of certain “higher critics” and shows that both variations and parallels in those Gospels can be adequately explained by normal workings of memory without having recourse to multiplied sources. The translation is clear and dignified: St. Matthew's style presents, indeed, few difficulties compared with the involved syntax and tumultuous thought of St. Paul: and the notes, with their abundance of cross-references, and quotations of Old Testament sources, are well calculated to help the student. The elucidation of St. Peter's Confession and our Lord's Promise of Primacy is a good specimen of concise and useful comment. The Gospel of St. Luke, now in preparation, will complete Vol. I.; Vols. III. and IV. are already published, whilst Vol. II. will contain St. John and The Acts.

SHORT NOTICES.

MORAL THEOLOGY.

THE Moral Theology (Marietti: 80.00 l.) of Father Joseph Aertnys, C.S.S.R., has now reached its eleventh edition, under the scholarly care of Father Damen, C.S.S.R. This manual of Moral Theology is, we consider, one of the great theological text-books of the day. The work has greatly increased in bulk, as Father Damen thought it well to depart from the original *format*, and to discard the double columns to the advantage of clearness and typographical elegance. The book, now issued in two volumes (pp. 763, 821), has a full index, both of the matter treated and of the canons, and the price is reasonable. The author deals at greater length than is usual with the occasions and the habit of sin. In this subject, to which he has given great thought, he proposes wise and useful rules for the confessor. Being a faithful disciple of St. Alphonsus, he defends the proposition that in strict doubt regarding the cessation of a law certainly promulgated, the law must be observed. Here, of course, the probabilist parts company with him, and the reviewer, being himself a probabilist, does not find any of the proofs which Father Damen gives in the least convincing. Moreover, canons 6 and 23 cannot be invoked in favour of his system, for these are the expressions of positive law. We were surprised to see how far-reaching is the range of the editor's quotations. He refers,

for instance (p. 398) to the *American Ecclesiastical Review* for 1927, where an opinion—an opinion which he treats benevolently—is expressed on the morality of a certain surgical operation. We are glad to see (II. p. 593, 4^o), that the author takes a strong attitude on a certain marriage case, which has been very much a matter of controversy in quite recent years. We believe that his opinion will safeguard the sanctity of marriage. We greatly doubt whether the "error communis" will give jurisdiction in marriage cases (II. p. 566, note), but we welcome the author's adherence to the view of Father Cappello on "error communis" (II. p. 251) in cases of absolution, a view that hitherto has had, we believe, very few adherents, though it is now beginning to recommend itself. If a student can carry on his course of Moral Theology for three years, we think that Father Damen's book will be found very suitable; it may always be used as reference book with the greatest profit.

DEVOTIONAL.

Not a little has been written in recent years on the subject of the meaning of prayer in the mind of St. Ignatius Loyola, and the place he assigns to it in his scheme of the Society of Jesus. In the *Revue de Philosophie*, in 1913, a not-too-friendly critic accused him of rigidity; of having introduced into his rules of prayer the cut and dried discipline of the soldier. Fixed quantity, fixed subject-matter, fixed method,—this, said the writer, was of the essence of the whole Ignatian system. Naturally this has stirred the zeal of some of the followers of Ignatius; perhaps not least because, on the surface, there is so much to be said in defence of this judgment of the saint. In *La Spiritualité de Saint Ignace*, by Alexandre Brou, S.J., a well-known French Jesuit writer sets himself to refute this idea. He examines the interior spirit of the Exercises, the teaching of St. Ignatius as discovered in his letters, that of his successors who may be supposed best to know his mind, and from all concludes that, while St. Ignatius was essentially an apostle of clear and strenuous thinking, yet no one more appreciated affective prayer or more encouraged his disciples to the practice of the higher forms.

French scouts have their Catholic Guide and Prayer Book in *Veillées de Prière*, by the Abbé Richaud, Diocesan Chaplain of the Scouts of Versailles (Téqui: 5 fr.). It is a closely-printed little book of 142 pages. In the first part all that goes to make a scout, the Promise, the Device, the Staff, the Camp, the Chief, etc., is taken both literally and symbolically; in the second part the scout's day is gone through, and a high standard, even for scouts, is set. There is an appendix of such prayers as a scout will need, including meditations for an all-night adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. Frenchmen, least of all French scouts, never do things by halves.

There is something laudably ambitious in the two volumes of *Conférences on the Interior Life*, by the Rev. A. M. Skelly, O.P. (Herder: 9s. each volume). Mystical theology still waits to be duly expressed in the English language; almost all the lore we have exists in translations. Father Skelly has chosen two standard theologians, Meynard and Vallgornera, to provide him with his background. On this he has arranged the teaching of many saints,—St. Thomas, St. Catherine of Siena,

St. Teresa, etc. Then, in a series of conferences, he goes through the recognized degrees of the Purgative and the Illuminative Ways, including in the latter what is usually assigned to the third Way, the Unitive or Contemplative. To each volume there is an Index, but we could wish they were more adequate. The author is at his best when he treats of prayer, but the whole work may help readers to understand the active element contained in the mystical life. Of one thing we complain: why has the book been written "for sisterhoods," and why is it addressed to a feminine audience? From the days of Jesus Christ and St. John mysticism has been essentially a man's experience, even more than of women. The priest at daily Mass is the ever-living proof.

Perhaps less ambitious, but none the less with the same object in view, is **Practical Ascetics**, by the Rev. Matthew J. W. Smith (Herder: 6s.). The work is described by the author as "for the use of Seminarians, Novices, Religious, Priests, and the Laity"; which suggests the humble enquiry,—for whose use is it not? In very brief chapters, sometimes of less than three pages, we are led through many paths of ascetical theology, the Redemption, Prayer, Self-Denial, Mortification, Humility, Fear of God, Examination of Conscience, Recollection, Faith, Hope, the Cardinal Virtues, etc. Interspersed are eminently work-a-day chapters: Natural Laws for Building of Strong Wills, A Scientific Cure for Impurity, The Value of both Physical and Mental Work for Spirituality, and the like. In a summary at the end we are shown how the whole of this book hangs together; in other words, while the author has wandered down many lanes on his way, it is made clear that all the time he has had a distinct goal in view and that he has reached it. His illustrations are within the reach of those for whom he has written, mentioned above; they are taken from the *Irish Messenger*, the *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, De Larde's *Catechism*, and other works close at hand.

At almost the opposite pole stands **Conferences for Religious Communities**, by Albert Muntsch, S.J. (Herder: 6s.). The author tells us in his Preface that "the purpose of the present work is to avoid as much as possible the hortatory tone and to present spiritual truths, familiar to all Religious, not in an entirely new way, but with the help of allusions to modern life and experience." This purpose he certainly fulfils. He passes through the modern day of a Religious, and shows how it may be sanctified in each duty; he takes up familiar virtues, poverty, humility, the spirit of sacrifice, etc., and shows their application to our times, taking his illustrations from very modern heroes, such as Lindberg and Amundsen, from the latest American and other writers, and from American history, such as the difference between Lincoln and Horace Greely. The conferences are informal; there appears to be no connection one with another; Father Muntsch has just reflected on the world around him, and from his reflections has given of his best. There is a quiet restraint felt in all that he says, counteracting any danger of undue digression to which his many "allusions to modern life" might have led him.

Some few years ago Father Bede Jarrett's "Meditations for Layfolk" proved by its success that there was room for a work of its kind. **Meditations for the Laity**, by the Rev. Albert Rung (Herder: 12s. 6d. n.), comes to us from America, and is another of the same type. It is a book

of over 500 pages; a little less than two pages are assigned to each day of the year. The subjects chosen do not, for the most part, seem to be arranged in any particular order, but there are few matters connected with the ordinary experiences of Christian life which are not somewhere touched upon. To take some at random: January 1, "True Devotion"; March 22, "Poverty of Spirit"; April 22, "Fidelity in small things"; July 24, "Perfect Security"; September 17, "Peace." The author's method is to give a paragraph or two of reflection on such topics, concluding with a resolve and a short prayer. In a Preface he explains the use to be made of the meditations given; an index of subjects is added, but we would suggest that it might be more adequate. Perhaps, too, in a future edition, a list of the contents as they are printed, according to the days assigned to them, might help the reader who would like to go back to old thoughts.

Not long since many Catholic readers found delight in two books which set before them, by means of many illustrations, the Argument from Design. They were called "Our Palace Wonderful" and "The Palace Beautiful," and were written by Father Frederick A. Houck. Now the same author gives us a volume on the relation between man and the Builder of that Palace, in **Godward: or the Rugged Path of Joys and Sorrows** (Herder: 7s. n.). He begins with the fundamental principle that man is made for God, and that on no other basis can he be explained. This leads him to enquire what we know of God, and of the works of God, in which latter are seen His care for man. From God's care for man there follows the care of man for God; his relation to Him in union by sanctifying grace, and in reunion by contrition, should the union ever have been broken. From union and reunion he comes to communion, in this world and in the next. Father Houck writes with great fervour. He is full of zeal, not only for the salvation of souls hereafter, but that here on earth they should realize how much they have about them from the hand of God which should make them rejoice always in Him.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

It is not long since we had the pleasure of noticing the Life of the Mother Foundress of the Daughters of the Cross. Now there comes to us **A Daughter of the Cross; Life and Mystical Letters of Sister Emilie**, by the Rev. C. Richstaetter, S.J., translated by F.C. (B.O. and W.: 7s. 6d.). To one who knows much of the interior spirit of these Sisters it comes as no surprise that one of their number—probably there are many more—can be shown to have climbed the highest mystical heights in the midst of a life of constant labour and trial. Sister Emilie was a child of a mixed marriage. For years her parents refused their consent to her becoming a Religious. When at last she conquered, her life became from the first a combination of anxious work—as a mistress of novices, as a reformer of a community, as a superior,—and of spiritual experiences which bear all the marks of true mysticism. She lived 1820—1859, and at her death many priests who knew her did not hesitate to speak of her as a saint. The second part of this volume contains many of her mystical letters which bear comparison with those of the best known mystics. The whole book carries with it conviction; the translation is well done.

MISCELLANEOUS.

On the strength of a personal conviction that the Germans attacked France in 1914 largely because French pacifists and humanitarians had given them grounds for thinking that France was not prepared or willing to resist, M. l'Abbé Giloteaux in his **Patriotisme et Internationalisme** (Téqui: 10.00 fr.) commits himself to the old fallacy, which all history disproves, that security lies in military strength, and, of course, quotes in support of his thesis that most lying of all proverbs, dear to every militarist and armament-manufacturer—*Si vis pacem, para bellum*. This mental attitude vitiates much of the arguments of his volume, which otherwise contains a deal of excellent teaching on its subject. But until people realize that "nationalism," which is patriotism run to seed, is more contrary to the Christian spirit than internationalism, which at least has in it the germs of Catholicity, the ideals so strongly urged by the Popes of our time will not find all the acceptance they should amongst Catholics. If the learned Abbé had devoted as much critical acumen to constructive work on behalf of Christian peace as he has, fairly enough, to pointing out the defects and limitations of the League of Nations, we should have been better able to recommend his book.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

Full of coloured illustrations of unequal merit, of short stories, of résumés of last year's events, of useful statistical information, the **Almanach du Pelerin for 1929** (Bonne Presse: 2.00 fr.) gives excellent value for its price.

We have not seen the English volume of which **Victimas y Verdugos!**, a sober study of the religious persecution in Mexico is said to be a translation, but it presents in accessible form the chief counts in the indictment against President Calles and his Government, and although it is printed in Belfast, it is clearly intended for use in Spanish-speaking countries.

In **Une Méditation pour Chaque Jour** (Téqui: 1.00 fr.), the reprint of a little work by the Bishop of Digne, the author has only the week in view, but in its forty pages he conveys much sound counsel and lofty inspiration.

Whether the reflections offered to the devout in Father Joseph Rickaby's latest book—**A Week of Communions** (Sands & Co.: 1s. 6d.)—ever actually formed the substance of exhortations we are not told; but in their printed form they are well adapted to provide a reasonable and practical basis for devotion and will be welcomed by frequent communicants.

A little known work—if work it can be called—by St. Teresa of Avila has been made accessible in English by one of the Stanbrook Benedictines, and is introduced by Dom Leonard Sargent, O.S.B. It is called **St. Teresa's Xmas Carols** (B.O. and W.: 1s.), and is meant as a gift-book for the season. The verses are simple to the verge of homeliness—such as the peasants of Palestine and Avila could easily understand, and they celebrate various episodes of the Divine Infancy.

The chivalrous spirit of the Elizabethan martyrs is well illustrated in **The Royal Road: a Life of Blessed Edmund Campion for Children** (B.O. and W.: 1s. 6d.), which tells the simple story of the Saint with references to his authentic sayings. The pretensions of Anglicanism cannot be better refuted than by records such as this.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

BRENTANO'S, London.

Red Mexico. By Francis McCullagh. Pp. xxiv. 325. Price, 15s. n.

BURNS, OATES AND WASHBOURNE, London.

The Catholic Church and the Citizen. By John A. Ryan. Pp. 94. Price, 4s. *The Catholic Church and Healing.* By James J. Walsh. Pp. 109. Price, 4s. *The Catholic and the Bible.* By Hugh Pope, O.P. Pp. 106. Price, 4s. *The Catholic Church and the Home.* By the Rev. James Gillis. Pp. 116. Price, 4s. *The Day Hours of the Church.* Edited by Abbot Carol. 4th edition. Pp. xvii. 1178. Price, 9s. n. *The Royal Road;* a life of Blessed Edmund Campion for Children. Pp. 30. Price, 1s. 6d.

DENT AND SONS, London.

The Vision of God. By Nicholas of Cusa. Translated by Emma Gurney. Pp. xxx. 130. Price, 5s. n. *Readings from Friedrich von Hügel.* Edited by Algar Thorold. Pp. xxvi. 359. Price, 7s. 6d. n.

DESCLEE DE BROUWER, Bruges.

Juris Canonici et Juris Canonico-civilis Compendium. By Canon A. De Meester. New edition. Vol. III. Part 2. Pp. viii. 347.

"EDITIONS SPES," Paris.

Le "Book of Common Prayer" et L'Eglise Anglicane. By J. Couturier. Pp. 227. Price, 6.00 fr.

HERDER, London.

The Saviour as St. Matthew saw Him. By F. J. Haggeneck, S.J. Vol. I. Pp. vii. 290. Price, 9s. *Christ in the Old and the New Testament.* By Sister Mary Gonzaga, Ph.D. Pp. xvi. 697. Price, 10s. 6d. *The Gospel for the Laity.* By F. J. Remler, C.M. Pp. xi. 319. Price, 7s. *Practical Ascetics.* By Rev. M. J. W. Smith. Pp. vii. 193. Price, 6s. *Conferences on the Interior Life.* By A. M. Shelly, O.P. 2 Vols. Pp. xii. 363: vii. 377. Price, 9s. each.

[Other acknowledgments unavoidably held over.]

LONGMANS, London.

The Shining Mystery of Jesus. By Douglas E. Edwards. Pp. xiii. 178. Price, 6s. n. *William J. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin.* By Mgr. P. J. Walsh. Pp. xvi. 612. Price, 21s. n. *Catholic Preachers of To-day.* Pp. xiv. 265. Price, 6s. n.

MARI E MARIETTI, Turin.

Summarium Philosophiae Christianae. By Dr. Alexander Speszy. Pp. vii. 352. Price, 12.50 l. *Theologiae Moralis* (Aertnys). Eleventh Edition in two Vols., edited by C. A. Damen, C.S.S.R. Pp. xx. 763, 821. Price, 80.00 l.

ROUTLEDGE AND SONS, London.

Fathers of the Church. Translated and edited by F. A. Wright. Pp. vi. 358. Price, 12s. 6d. n. *Allegiance in Church and State.* By L. M. Hawkins. Pp. viii. 200. Price, 6s. n.

SANDS AND CO., London.

A Nobleman of Italy. By A. Koch, S.J. Translated by D. Donnelly, S.J. Pp. vi. 166. Price, 3s. 6d. n. *A Week of Communions.* By J. Rickaby, S.J. Pp. 63. Price, 1s. 6d. n. *The Advent Epistles and Gospels* (Keppler). Translated by Rev. H. Macdonald. Pp. xv. 208. Price, 6s. n.

SHEED AND WARD, London.

Holy Night, a Mystery Play. By G. M. Sierra. Translated by P. Hereford. Pp. 56. Price, 5s. *Three Reformers.* By M. Jacques Maritain. Pp. 234. Price, 7s. 6d. n. *Let's Go!* By T. Gavan Duffy. Illustrated. Pp. 511. Price, 10s. 6d.

TEQUI, Paris.

Mgr. Gibier. By A. Lugan. Pp. 38. *Marguerite Sinclair.* By Mgr. Laveille. 2nd Edit. Pp. vi. 192. Price, 8.00 fr. *Patriotisme et Internationalisme.* By Abbé Paul Giloteaux. Pp. 278. Price, 10.00 fr.

THE AUTHOR, Belfast.

Victimas y' Verdugos! From the English of Cesar Miles. Pp. viii. 126.

